

lution 290, Seventy-sixth Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 251). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Senate Concurrent Resolution 9. Concurrent resolution condemning outrages inflicted upon civilians in the Nazi occupied countries and favoring punishment of persons responsible therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 252). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 2201. A bill providing for an Assistant Secretary of Commerce for small business; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LANE:

H. R. 2202. A bill to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 2203. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. R. 2204. A bill relating to pay, allowances, and insurance for members of the land or naval forces training to be pilots under the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROWE:

H. R. 2205. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America," approved March 2, 1907, so as to permit such federation to extend certain benefits to all its members; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 2206. A bill to amend the National Housing Act, as now or hereafter amended, so as to give protection to persons in military service, and their dependents, as to certain mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 2207. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MCCORMACK:

H. R. 2208. A bill to promote the national defense and to facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment and essential to domestic requirements through safe and adequate inland waterways, by the immediate authorization of the construction of the New York Bay-Delaware River section of the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 2209. A bill to cover the positions of registers of the district land offices into the classified civil service and to fix the compensation thereof; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

H. R. 2210. A bill to fix the compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution to permit retailers to combine in negotiating purchases from suppliers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. J. Res. 100. Joint resolution extending the time within which certain acts under

the Internal Revenue Code are required to be performed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. Res. 171. Resolution to establish a special committee to be known as the Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 2211. A bill for the relief of Francesco Antonio Patata; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2212. A bill for the relief of Clarence Waverly Morgan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON:

H. R. 2213. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Wolters; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McWILLIAMS:

H. R. 2214. A bill for the relief of the East Coast Ship and Yacht Corporation, of Noank, Conn.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2215. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice V. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 2216. A bill for the relief of Solon P. Haun; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHWABE:

H. R. 2217. A bill granting a pension to Ethel Forbes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 17, 1943

(Legislative day of Tuesday, March 9, 1943)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Hunter M. Lewis, B. D., associate minister, Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Eternal God, who in times past didst lead our forefathers from lands of oppression, and open before them in the wilderness a new land which by Thy gracious providence has become great among the nations: We beseech Thee to continue thy loving kindness to us, that in these days of strife and strain we lose not the vision of freedom, justice, and equality which Thou didst reveal to them. Guide, we pray Thee, all those to whom Thou hast committed the Government of our Nation, and grant to them at this time special gifts of wisdom and understanding, of counsel and of strength.

Bless all who labor in field and factory, in office and home for our country's welfare. May they labor for the work's sake without undue thought of gain, unspoiled by the increase of income, seeking to give the best that is in them.

And stretch forth, we beseech Thee, Thine almighty arm to strengthen and protect the defenders of our country, wherever they may serve at home or abroad, on land, sea, or in the air. Bless them and the cause in which we send them forth. Endue them with courage and loyalty, with patience, fortitude and endurance, and lead them to Thine own

victory of righteousness and peace. We ask it all in the name and for the sake of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

#### NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER

The Secretary (Edwin A. Halsey) read the following letter:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D. C., March 17, 1943.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS, a Senator from the State of Illinois, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARTER GLASS,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. LUCAS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 16, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

##### REPORT OF SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the seventh annual report of the Social Security Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

##### REPORT OF OPERATIONS OF OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT RENT CONTROL ADMINISTRATOR

A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the second semiannual report of the operations of the Office of Administrator of Rent Control of the District of Columbia, covering the period July 1, 1942, to December 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

##### DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War, Navy (3), Interior, Agriculture (3), and Commerce; Federal Works Agency (2), The National Archives, and the District Court of the Northern District of California which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of Hollywood Parlor, No. 196, Native Sons of the Golden West, of Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against the formation of a Japanese unit of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Finance:

"Whereas the people of Texas are required to pay Federal taxes to support Federal social-security programs for maternal and child-health services in all the States; and

"Whereas the State of Texas, in order to participate in the Federal program, is required to subscribe to certain conditions laid down in the Federal Social Security Act, including State plans drawn on a Federal pattern; and

"Whereas under the provisions of title V of the Social Security Act the Texas State plans, in order to receive the approval of the Federal administrative agency for participation in the maternal and child-health program, are required to embrace all and such policies, measures, and means in carrying out the State program as will currently satisfy the desires of the Federal Children's Bureau as to propriety and efficiency (title V, sec. 503 (a), 3), among which is the requirement that the State of Texas shall subscribe to and practice a program which denies the right of choice of physician to the intended beneficiaries of the Texas maternal and child-health program (if the State is to participate in the Federal social-security funds for State plans, which its people have already paid for in Federal taxes); and

"Whereas the latest example of the requirement by the Children's Bureau that choice of physician shall be surrendered in order to participate in the Federal program is represented in the subsidy offered by the Children's Bureau under the Federal Social Security Act for the purpose of implementing professional medical services and care to the wives and families of servicemen as follows: That the State plan shall restrict the expenditure of any of the funds for physicians' services except for the use of doctors approved by the American Medical Association (May 1, 1942, memorandum to State health agencies from the Director, Division of Health Services, Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, subject Medical and Hospital Obstetric and Pediatric Care for Wives and Infants of Men in Military Service: '3. Standards of medical care: Medical care provided under the plan should be authorized by the State health agency only when the attending physician is licensed to practice in the State and is a graduate of a medical school approved by the council on medical education of the American Medical Association'); and

"Whereas the State of Texas exacts a high standard of proficiency in all the practitioners of the healing art who are licensed to practice, and there are numerous such legally licensed practitioners who belong to schools of medicine that are not affiliated with the American Medical Association and are not required to be so affiliated under the Texas law; and

"Whereas freedom of choice of physician is an integral part of the Texas Constitution in that it specifically provides against the making of any Texas law which gives any preference to any school of medicine, regardless of the affiliation or nonaffiliation of any such school (Texas Constitution, art. XVI, sec. 31); and

"Whereas the Social Security act in effect, places the fitness and qualification of a physician in the Council on Medical Education of the American Medical Association, which is un-American, undemocratic, and is the only profession that is licensed by the laws of various States in the United States, and controlled by a law, rule, or regulation of the Federal Government. This act denies to the taxpayers and citizens throughout the United States the right to choose their physician; and

"Whereas there are counties in the State of Texas, in which, if this rule is enforced, the wives and children of men now in the Army will be denied the services of a physician and

surgeon, as there are duly qualified, licensed, practicing physicians and surgeons who have been practicing for years, for whom the citizenship has the highest regard as to their ability and integrity, and they, although licensed and qualified, will not be eligible to render the services required: Therefore be it

*"Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas assembled at Austin, that the Congress should amend the Federal Social Security Act in such manner as to prevent the Federal administrative agencies, specifically the Children's Bureau, from any requirement, policy, or pressure involving coercion or inducement of the States to practice or sanction denial of choice of physician as a part of State plans necessary to participate in the Federal program of maternal and child health generally or services to the wives and children of servicemen in particular; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States; HENRY A. WALLACE, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives; and to the Senators and Congressmen from the State of Texas."*

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A telegram embodying a resolution adopted by Col. Francis Hamtramck Post, No. 1, P. L. A. V., at Hamtramck, Detroit, Mich., protesting against any proposed annexation of the eastern territories of the Republic of Poland and favoring full justice to Poland and the preservation of all Polish rights against aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Altrusa Club, of Los Angeles, Calif., praying for the adoption of the so-called equal rights amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of sundry citizens of Little River Kan., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McNARY:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Commerce.

"House Joint Memorial 8

*"To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:*

*"Whereas the Federal Government of the United States, through its Bonneville administration and other Federal agencies, has built and is operating the Bonneville Dam and the Grand Coulee Dam and an extensive system of transmission lines and plant equipment; and*

*"Whereas the Federal Government, through its Bonneville administration, is in the business of making and selling large quantities of electric energy; and*

*"Whereas these facilities owned by the Federal Government do replace or compete with existing facilities which are taxable in the States of Oregon and Washington and which are a substantial part of their tax structures; and*

*"Whereas to date no provision has been made for the payment by the Bonneville administration of any portion of its gross revenues to the States of Oregon and Washington in lieu of taxes, as has been provided in the acts which govern the Federal operations of Boulder Dam and the Tennessee Valley Authority: Now, therefore, be it*

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the senate jointly concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to enact such legislation as will correct this inequity and will require of the Bonne-*

ville administration a payment in lieu of taxes to the States of Oregon and Washington on a basis substantially equivalent to that which has been found proper in the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority and Boulder Dam; and be it further

*"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to United States Senators CHARLES L. McNARY and RUFUS C. HOLMAN, and to Congressmen JAMES W. MOTT, HOMER D. ANGELL, LOWELL STOCKMAN, and HARRIS ELLSWORTH, and also to the Senators and Congressmen from the State of Washington, with the request that they support legislation to make this memorial effective; and*

*"That the secretary of state of the State of Oregon be, and he hereby is, instructed to forward a certified copy of this memorial to the President of the United States, the President and Chief Clerk of the United States Senate, the Speaker and Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to the Governor of the State of Washington and the president of the senate and speaker of the house of representatives of that State."*

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore also laid before the Senate a joint memorial identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.)

By Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

Two resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

*"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation substantially in accordance with the Ruml plan for the deferred collection of the income tax*

*"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation substantially in accordance with the Ruml plan, so called; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent by the State secretary to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Members of the Congress from Massachusetts."*

*"Resolution memorializing Congress to increase the bed capacity of the West Roxbury Veterans' Hospital*

*"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby urges upon the Congress of the United States the necessity for increasing without delay the capacity of the West Roxbury Veterans' Hospital to 2,000 beds, so as to meet the mounting hospital needs of the veterans in this area; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."*

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate two resolutions identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.)

By Mr. WALSH (for himself and Mr. LODGE):

Two resolutions of the General Court of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

*"Resolution memorializing Congress to adopt an adequate antilynch law*

*"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States to adopt, and the President of the United States to sign, an adequate antilynch law which would enlist the powers of the Federal Government in learning the identity of, and prosecuting, those participating in lynch mobs, those responsible for inciting such mobs, and those local law enforcement officers who re-*



main lax or passive while a lynching is committed; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

"Resolution memorializing Congress to enact the anti-poll-tax bill, so-called

"Whereas many colored people are fighting in the armed forces of the United States to protect and preserve the principles of democracy for which the United Nations stand: Therefore be it

"Resolved That the General Court of Massachusetts hereby memorializes the Seventy-eighth Congress of the United States to enact, and the President of the United States to sign, the so-called anti-poll-tax bill to the end that millions of citizens of the United States residing in several of our Southern States shall have restored to them their democratic right to vote; and be it further

"Resolved That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress, and to the Members thereof from this Commonwealth."

(The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate two resolutions identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

#### RESOLUTIONS OF VERMONT GENERAL ASSEMBLY—THE DAIRY INDUSTRY AND ALLOTMENTS OF FARM MACHINERY

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I offer for the Record two certified copies of resolutions adopted by the General Assembly of Vermont. Joint House Resolution 18 is entitled "Joint resolution relating to restrictions on the dairy industry during wartime," and

Joint House Resolution 26 is entitled "Joint resolution relating to wartime allotments of farm machinery."

Both these resolutions were approved by the Governor of Vermont on March 13, 1943.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolutions be referred to the appropriate committee and printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the Record, under the rule, as follows:

Whereas the cooperation of all agencies, Federal and State, and individuals in the several States has been, and is being, urged for the most efficient prosecution of the war; and

Whereas one of the factors most essential to the successful prosecution of the war is the maximum production possible of dairy products for our armed forces and allies and for the citizenry of the Allied Nations; and

Whereas the desired result can be achieved only by the cooperation of the boards of health of the several States, particularly those to which the greater portion of the dairy products of this State are shipped; and

Whereas the strict enforcement of the present requirements and restrictions of the boards of health will in many cases cause producing dairymen to reduce or sell their herds, and the proposed discontinuance of numerous creameries for the purported purpose of conserving manpower and supplies will tend, especially in what is known in the industry as a flush season, still more to handicap dairymen, because thereby the number of dairies per transporting truck, the number of stops and the time of loading and

unloading, will be greatly increased, thus necessitating the still greater increase in the length of the day of the producer, and for that reason a still greater reduction in available farm labor; and

Whereas the average dairy farmer is now forced to work a week of 75 or 80 hours and is unable to convert returned milk into butter, because of lack of time, labor, and equipment, necessitating the dumping of such returned milk: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States be, and he hereby is, respectfully urged to consider the following:

1. That the importance is the quality of milk and not the place of production;

2. That country dairy plants be allowed to extend the time for the reception of milk;

3. That no milk be rejected and returned to the producer unless it has been ascertained to be unsafe for human consumption;

4. That in cases where dairies are excluded for high bacteria count or other reasons inspectors of the board of health and other officials cooperate as far as possible and expedient with dairymen to ascertain and remedy the cause;

5. That owing to the extreme difficulty in obtaining farm labor, equipment, and materials, no new drastic regulations be imposed on dairymen during the present emergency;

6. That boards of health in jurisdictions where the dairy products of this State are used or consumed cooperate with producers of dairy products to the end that the supply of milk be maintained and so far as possible increased as required for the successful prosecution of the war; and be it further

Resolved, That the Honorable Secretary issue such orders and regulations as will insure the cooperation of all Federal agencies having jurisdiction as to dairy products and their production with boards of health and producers to the end that production be maintained and the needs of our armed forces and our population and those of our allies be met; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture, to all members of the Vermont congressional delegation, the Boston City Board of Health and the New York City Board of Health.

Whereas one of Vermont's greatest contributions to winning the war is the willingness, ability, and natural instinct of her farmers to produce more food, the present real essential which would hasten the end of the war; and

Whereas food has virtually been the decisive factor in the successful prosecution of previous wars; and

Whereas the definite shortage of farm labor makes our farmer's need for farm machinery more essential than ever before in order to "raise more food and cattle"—the war cry from the Secretary of Agriculture and other Government officials responsible for the prosecution of the war; and

Whereas the allotted quota of farm machinery to each county is far below the actual need and should be at least doubled in amount: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate and house of representatives, That the people of Vermont represented in this general assembly cannot too strongly impress upon the authorities in Washington who are responsible in setting the allotted quota of farm machinery of how inadequate the allotment to Vermont is in comparison to its actual needs; and be it further

Resolved, That Vermont's Representatives in Congress exert every effort to bring about an increase in the present allotment quota of at least double the quota already set; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent forthwith by the secretary of state to

Vermont's Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

#### RESOLUTION OF BELLVIEW GRANGE NO. 1655, FREDONIA, KANS.—FAIR PRICES FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present and to have printed in the Record and appropriately referred a resolution recently adopted by the Bellview Grange No. 1655, Fredonia, Kans., in which they take a stand for fair prices which will guarantee cost of production as being an advantage over subsidies and parity payments.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

BELLVIEW GRANGE, No. 1655,  
PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY,  
Fredonia, Kans., March 21, 1943.  
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,  
Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution was passed by the Bellview Grange, No. 1655 on March 10, 1943, and ordered sent to our Members in Congress and the Secretary of Agriculture. We would like for you to give this favorable attention:

"Resolved, That the Bellview Grange is on record as being opposed to subsidies and special crop parity payments for agriculture but rather is in favor of fair prices which will guarantee cost of production and a fair profit for all farm commodities."

Fraternally,

Mrs. MARIE MYERS,  
Secretary.

#### LETTER FROM WILLIAM W. DUNCAN—TAXES ON SMALL INCOMES

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I present a letter which I ask may be treated in the nature of a petition and referred to the Committee on Finance. I ask that it be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the letter presented by the Senator from Massachusetts will be referred to the Committee on Finance, and the clerk will read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the letter, as follows:

THE EQUITABLE LIFE ASSURANCE  
SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Boston, Mass., March 5, 1943.  
Senator DAVID I. WALSH,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR WALSH: I wrote you a letter last fall regarding the effect of the tax bill upon widows and retired people with small incomes.

I have just finished making quite a few income tax reports on this type of person, particularly those having incomes between \$800 and \$1,000 a year. If you will look at 1040A report, I believe you will find that such a widow with a \$950 income or \$81 a month has to pay a tax of \$71, and believe me, in every case that I have seen these people are struggling to maintain one room and some of the comforts of life to which they have been accustomed.

Will it not be possible for such person or persons to file a report and upon affidavit that their income is not earned and does not exceed, say \$1,000 single and \$1,500 married, to have the tax waived, as is done in Massachusetts?

Yours very truly,

WM. W. DUNCAN,  
Supervisor.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LODGE, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 886. A bill relating to the selective-service deferment, on occupational grounds, of persons employed by the Federal Government; without amendment (Rept. No. 120).

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 241. A bill for the relief of Rachel Acerra; with an amendment (Rept. No. 121); and

H. R. 1279. A bill for the relief of Lee Watts; without amendment (Rept. No. 122).

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BYRD:

S. 887. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of John Weakley and Rella Moyer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 888 (by request). A bill to establish a domestic allotment plan for basic agricultural commodities, to regulate commerce in such commodities, and to provide for the orderly marketing of such commodities at fair prices in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. NYE:

S. J. Res. 45. Joint resolution relating to emergency crop, seed, and feed loans and to regional agricultural credit corporation loans; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

## ORGANIZATION OF UNITED NATIONS—AMENDMENT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 114

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, yesterday the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], for himself and on behalf of three other Senators, submitted Senate Resolution 114 providing as follows:

That the Senate advises that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority—

as further set out in the resolution.

The inspiration of this resolution is without doubt the age-old longing for a wise and certain solution of mankind's desire for lasting peace. Surely it will be a sad commentary on the present generation which experienced a disastrous war a quarter of a century ago, a devastating depression growing out of that war, and which is again involved in a war of catastrophic proportions, if we cannot take some steps toward the goal of permanent peace. I have no intention at this time to comment further on the broad objectives of the resolution.

Mr. President, in our form of government there are certain limitations of the powers which were granted by the people to their Congress and to their Executive. Among these is the limitation that all treaties made with other nations must be with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Senator from Minne-

sota recognized that fact in the able address he made when he submitted the resolution. These limitations on the several branches of our Government must be recognized at every step of the way we take in our effort to reach the very laudable goal set forth.

Mr. President, the line of demarcation between what constitutes a treaty with other nations, which must have the approval of a two-thirds vote of the Senate, and agreements made by the Executive which have had only a majority vote of both Houses of Congress has, in late years, become a twilight zone of considerable area within which our efforts may be attended with confusion.

In entering upon a problem of such magnitude as that involved in the resolution submitted by the Senator from Minnesota, it is only the part of wisdom and practical expediency that the limitations upon those who conduct the negotiations on behalf of the United States shall be clearly defined. The people of the United States need the reassurance that their sacred rights will not be violated. Those who outline specifically the aspirations of the United States in this matter must bear in mind continually the limitations of their authority, and in that spirit of frankness only under which a sound and lasting understanding can be developed, the peoples of other nations should have plainly in their minds the same limitations.

Mr. President, I ask consent to present an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the resolution submitted by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] and other Senators, being the resolution (S. Res. 114) favoring the organization of the United Nations to maintain peace, and ask that it be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment of the Senator from Indiana will be read for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the resolution it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph, as follows:

Any agreement concluded in accordance with the provisions of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall not be binding upon the Government of the United States until a proposal of such agreement shall have been submitted to the United States Senate and concurred in by two-thirds of the Senators present.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be printed and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

## SELECTION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF FEDERAL FIELD OFFICES (S. DOC. NO. 22)

Mr. HAYDEN presented a manuscript prepared by the Legislative Service of the Library of Congress relating to the selection and establishment of Federal field offices, which, on request of Mr. HAYDEN, was ordered to be printed.

## TRAINING OF ENLISTED RESERVISTS UNDER CIVIL AERONAUTICS AUTHORITY

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, a number of Senators have made inquiry of me as to the status of certain enlisted reservists who are undergoing training under the supervision of the C. A. A. War Training Service. In response to their letters I asked for the information from the Civil Aeronautics Division of the Department of Commerce. I have a letter stating the facts, and I think the contents of the letter are sufficiently interesting to justify printing the letter in the RECORD. I believe that Members of Congress would be glad to have the information. Therefore I ask leave to have the letter printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,  
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, March 12, 1943.

HON. JOSIAH W. BAILEY,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR BAILEY: Owing to the absence from Washington of Mr. William A. M. Burden, I am writing to give you the information requested in your letter of March 9, concerning the status of certain enlisted reservists who are being trained under the supervision of the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service.

The accompanying memorandum outlines the arrangements under which these men are receiving training. As stated therein, they do not receive any pay, allowances, or other compensation. They must make their own arrangements to provide the funds needed to supply pocket money and to pay for personal necessities other than those which are provided in the way of board, lodging, nonmilitary uniforms, and equipment, by the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service. In this connection, however, it should be mentioned that men who are carried through to graduation from the pilot instructor course will have received approximately \$5,000 worth of free tuition from the Government and will have acquired skills which should enable them to earn satisfactory incomes. This is important when it is remembered that the men are being trained as noncombat service pilots with a view to employment by the Army in a civilian capacity as instructors in the Army's civil contract schools or as transport copilots.

As you know, the training program conducted by the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service (formerly known as Civilian Pilot Training) has gone through two major phases. The third phase has commenced and will soon be fully in operation.

The first phase covered the period from the enactment of the Civilian Pilot Training Act in 1939 until June 30, 1942. In that phase, the program was essentially a program for the training of civilians. It was largely an extracurricular activity carried on in conjunction with the regular education of young men in the colleges or in other institutions of higher learning. It could be and was a decentralized program. The persons who received training as pilots were civilians in every sense of the word and were wholly free to employ the techniques and skills which they had acquired in whatever way best suited their individual inclinations and opportunities.

The program which was conducted during the first phase equipped many thousands of



men to take their places promptly and effectively in war aviation. The rapid expansion of our Navy and Army Air Forces was aided materially by the existence of this trained group.

Following our entry into the war, it became apparent that it would be necessary greatly to accelerate the training program and to place it on a more definitely controlled and centralized basis. Planning to this end went on in the early months of 1942. Effective July 1, 1942, the training program was launched on its second phase.

During this second phase, after July 1, 1942, all of the training facilities available through the Civil Aeronautics Administration were employed exclusively for the training of men having Reserve status in the Army or Navy.

The field organization of the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service undertook the responsibility of acting, in a sense, as a recruiting agency to provide non-combat service pilots for the Army. All of the men undergoing training by Civil Aeronautics Administration for the Army Air Forces were examined and selected by the Civil Aeronautics Administration organization or by contractors working under the supervision of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Following selection, these men were presented to the Army recruiting centers for voluntary enlistment. While undergoing training, they were enlisted members of the Reserve on inactive status. But they were being trained as civilians, and, as I have said, it was intended that many of them, on completion of their training, should be employed in a civilian status, some as pilots with the air-transport service, others as instructors in the Army's civil contract primary schools or as instructors with the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service. Their enlistment in the Reserve was intended to accomplish two purposes. It involved a definite commitment on the part of the trainee to devote himself to service in the war program, as a civilian or otherwise, on the completion of his training. At the same time, his Reserve status gave him assurance that he would not be called into service as a soldier through the operation of the National Selective Service Act until his training as a pilot had been completed or until he had been eliminated from further training because of failure to meet the required tests and examinations.

Many of the men who were enlisted in the Army Air Corps Enlisted Reserve during the second phase of the program are still in training, and we expect that their training will be completed in accordance with the arrangements which were contemplated at the time of their acceptance for training as Air Corps enlisted reservists on inactive status as outlined in the accompanying paper.

It is estimated that approximately 12,500 of these men are now undergoing training or are awaiting assignment to training. Enlistment in the Reserve for the purpose of this training was stopped by the manpower directive of December 5, 1942, which prohibited voluntary enlistment in the Army or Navy, including their reserve components.

Prior to December 15, 1942, the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service was also engaged in providing elementary and certain other classes of flight instruction for a group of naval enlisted reservists on inactive status. These men were not paid. They were trained under the same general conditions as those which applied to the Army Air Corps enlisted reservists on inactive status. There was, however, one important difference in their status. The naval reservists were aviation cadet candidates physically qualified as combat pilots and were undergoing training preliminary to active training by the

Navy for combat duty. Largely because of this fact, the Navy took action effective December 15, 1942, to call all of these men to active duty, and since that date they have been in receipt of the regular authorized pay for the Navy while undergoing training under the supervision of the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Center.

In conjunction with the college program which has been arranged by the Army, a large number of Army Air Corps aviation cadet candidates are being placed in the colleges for academic instruction. While undergoing such instruction, they are to have the status of enlisted men on active duty and will be paid accordingly by the Army. Each month approximately one-fifth of the number of these aviation cadets are to be given elementary flight instruction through the Civil Aeronautics Administration War Training Service. Prior to being called to active duty for the purpose of undergoing academic instruction in the colleges, these men were, for the most part, Army Air Corps enlisted reservists on inactive status. They are, of course, destined for training and employment as Army combat pilots.

The remaining group—that is, the Army Air Corps enlisted reservists on inactive status about whom you have inquired—will then be the only group of men who have been enlisted in the Reserve to be trained as pilots (in this case, as noncombat pilots) for whom no provision has been made in the way of compensation payments.

A good many complaints have been registered from various sections of the country as to the status of these men. Rightly or wrongly, the view appears to be held that they should be given the same treatment as has been accorded to the aviation cadet (combat pilots) candidates of the Army and Navy.

It is not desirable, in our judgment, that the noncombat group of trainees be called to active duty as soldiers since such action would make it impossible to employ them in a civilian status in the war effort on completion of their training. Accordingly, if it is the view of the Congress that they should receive compensation at the rates which they would receive as enlisted men on active duty, it would seem desirable that arrangements be made to provide for the payment of such compensation without having them called to active duty with the Army.

This would apparently require specific legislative authorization together with a supplementary appropriation to provide funds required to make compensation payments. The Bureau of the Budget has not approved submission to the Congress of any proposals or requests relating to this matter.

The correspondence which accompanied your letter is returned herewith.

Sincerely yours,

R. McLEAN STEWART,  
Executive Director of Training.

#### OPERATIONS OF LOCAL DRAFT BOARDS— STATEMENT BY JOHN J. GRIFFIN

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article relative to the operation of local draft boards, embodying a statement by Col. John J. Griffin, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### NATIONAL RESOURCES PLANNING BOARD—ARTICLE BY JOSEPH P. McMURRAY

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Despite Great Achievements the National Resources Planning Board Faces Extinction," written by Joseph P. McMurray, and published in the March 13, 1943, edition of America, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### DEFERMENT FROM MILITARY SERVICE OF PERSONS ENGAGED IN AGRICULTURE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 729) providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gillette	Overton
Austin	Gurney	Pepper
Bailey	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Reynolds
Bone	Holman	Robertson
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Scruggs
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brooks	Kilgore	Smith
Buck	La Follette	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Tobey
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Downey	Murdock	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] are necessarily absent.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKEL-LAR], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Senate.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is necessarily absent.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to address myself for a few moments to

the pending amendment, with respect to which I ask unanimous consent that the name of the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] be added as cosponsor, if there is no objection.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I thought that the name of the Senator from West Virginia appeared at the time of the offering of the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. I had understood, although I may be in error, that the able Senator from West Virginia had asked that the amendment be offered in the name of the junior Senator from Florida, but perhaps I am mistaken.

Mr. McNARY. I think I should have to object to a request of this kind. Any document when offered must of course bear the name of one or the names of more than one sponsor, and in that form it is referred to a committee. Later, after the document has been referred to a committee and is on the floor of the Senate, I do not think it would be appropriate to ask that the name of another Senator be included as a sponsor. I am willing to concede that the Senator from West Virginia is in favor of the proposal of the Senator from Florida, in fact, he spoke in support of it yesterday; but I should prefer that the RECORD be not changed to include any other name than that appearing at the time the document was presented.

Mr. PEPPER. I withdraw the request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request of the Senator from Florida is withdrawn.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I had an opportunity yesterday to witness something which made a very deep impression upon me. By arrangements made some days ago I was present when representatives of the Office of Price Administration heard the vegetable growers of Florida with respect to fixing a ceiling price upon vegetables, and I saw gathered in a great market, while the trucks were moving vegetables from the fields to this market for sale and transportation to the consumption centers of the country, some six or eight hundred vegetable growers.

Those men were not theorists; those men were not jobbers, brokers, or tradesmen in vegetables. Those men were the actual dirt producers of vegetables. They were not only of the farm; they were farmers themselves. All through the day I heard those men from the farms tell of the problems they had in trying to get their hard-earned money back out of the soil, and principally the difficulty they had in getting enough labor to do it. I was told again and again that literally thousands of acres of fresh vegetables so vitally needed by the people of this country, men, women, and children, so vitally needed by the war workers and the soldiers and our allies, were going to rot in the fields because those growers could not get the labor with which to harvest those products.

Anyone who hears that story first hand from men who have invested thousands of dollars of their money in such crops, who sees the deep earnestness on their faces, and hears the note of sincerity in their voices, cannot fail to be impressed

by the seriousness of the labor problem which faces agriculture in our country.

I stated to that group of growers that I expected today to oppose the amendment of my able and devoted friend the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and I stated why I proposed to oppose the able Senator's amendment. First, because I thought it did not solve the problem of putting labor upon the farms; that it was the case, as a Senator has already said on the floor of the Senate, of locking the barn door after the horse is stolen. The labor has already been taken from the farms by the draft, and by induction into industry and better-paid occupations. I believe the figures were given by my able friend the Senator from Alabama, the sponsor of this amendment, that probably where three men eligible for the draft had gone into the service seven had gone into industry, if I do not incorrectly remember the figures he gave.

Why that is true is obvious when we reflect upon the figures which the able Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] recently gave upon the floor of the Senate, and I regret to say that my section of the country is one of the greatest offenders in the matter of the payment of low wages to those engaged in agriculture. A principal difficulty, therefore, comes about from the disparity between the wage the farm worker receives when he works upon the farm and what he would receive if he obtained a place in industry.

The average monthly wage in agriculture in 1942, without board, was \$56.07. This figure is taken from the table inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, March 19, by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], appearing on page 1779.

By contrast, the average hourly entrance rates for common labor in manufacturing industries, as calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, permit a man working straight time with no overtime to earn almost \$94 per month. In 1942 the average entrance rate for common labor in industry was 58.5 cents per hour. Working a normal 40-hour week, a worker could earn approximately \$93.60. This is a 67-percent higher wage than he could earn in agriculture. Average entrance rates and earnings for common labor in building construction and in the war industries are considerably higher. In aircraft-engine factories an ordinary unskilled worker could earn on straight time over \$130 per month. In shipyards he could earn up to \$150 per month, although in some shipyards earnings are considerably lower than this figure.

With the establishment of the 48-hour week the worker entering industry has the opportunity to earn 30 percent more than the monthly rates cited above. The farm worker who moves into war industry is thus able to earn from two to almost four times as much as the average wage paid to farm labor in 1942. Because we did not have a comprehensive manpower policy in this country, because we allowed the Army and the Navy and the other services to take labor from the farms, because we allowed industry, for perfectly

legitimate reasons, to drain the farms of their men, we have the manpower shortage which now faces us. So, passing this bill simply to defer the men still on the farms is not going to put that labor back upon the farms which has already gone into the services and into industry.

Mr. President, in the second place I oppose the amendment of the able Senator from Alabama, as modified, because it disestablishes the principle of personal accountability to serve one's country in the draft. It gives a blanket deferment not to a few people, as for example, the 531 who are Members of Congress—and the able Senator from Iowa awhile ago referred to the fact that there has already been class deferments because Congress had been deferred. The total number deferred in the Congress is only 531. That would not make a very large army. In addition to that the age of Members of Congress is well known to the country; so that that blanket deferment of the Congress actually kept very few men out of the armed services of the Nation. In the Senate itself I believe I am the third youngest Senator, and I am 42 years old; I doubt, therefore, if more than 2 or 3 Senators at the outside would have been drafted had that blanket deferment not been provided in the draft law.

Mr. President, the principle of democracy in selective service is that every man's case is passed upon according to its merits, with the exception of the few exemptions provided in the bill totaling not many hundreds.

If we have a blanket deferment, therefore, we will have this sort of situation: There will be a prosperous farmer living upon a large farm; he will have a son who is about to reach the age of 18. When that boy reaches 18 years, if he performs any kind of farm work, then under the provisions of the amendment offered by the able Senator from Alabama, if it shall be adopted, that boy by the authority of Congress is kept out of the service of his country. But if a quarter of a mile down the road there is a little country merchant who has a son who becomes 18 years of age, or if there is a widow who runs a boarding house nearby whose son comes to the age of 18, that boy has to go to the service, unless the individual case is deferred by the draft board.

Mr. President, if a boy is essential to the maintenance of an agricultural operation which itself is essential, then the boy ought to be deferred, but that case ought to be passed on individually, and not be the subject of blanket legislation enacted by the National Congress hundreds or thousands of miles away from the scene and the persons involved.

We already know that a large number of these boys have gone from the farms. I stood yesterday in front of a service center in Fort Lauderdale, and I saw literally hundreds and hundreds of names which were there emblazoned on that roll of honor to indicate the number of boys from that one community who have already gone to the service. As a matter of fact it is astonishing to find how many have been taken out of every community. So most of these farm boys



who have reached the eligible age for the draft have already gone into the service. They did not have the benefit of draft legislation of blanket character enacted by the Congress. They were passed upon in respect to their individual cases.

We know that there have already been many deferments of agricultural labor by the draft boards. But where those deferments have occurred the individual case of the individual boy has justified such deferment. I am not willing to take the responsibility as a Senator to lay down a blanket rule that will draw a line of demarcation and set aside a special class of our citizens who under any and all circumstances are entitled to exemption and immunity from a duty to serve their country when no other class in the Nation is similarly situated. If there were provision in this amendment so that the matter of deferment were an individual matter relative to the need of the family of the boy called or the situation of the young man himself, that would be an entirely different matter, and this particular objection which I feel toward it would not exist in my mind.

So I say that two reasons—and I believe they are worthy of consideration—namely, first, that passage of this bill will not put back upon the farm the labor which was once there and which has already gone into the service and into industry, and, second, because it is not fair to give a blanket deferment to any class of men—will lead me to opposition, as I told this group of 800 dirt farmers yesterday, to this bill.

Mr. President, the other objection I have to it is that it is not a comprehensive approach to this difficult problem of making the best use of the Nation's manpower. I do not propose any panacea for the difficult problem; in fact, it comes the nearest to being an enigma of almost any problem of which I know. For example, you run into this dilemma: The farmers admittedly are opposed to subsidy, even for labor, although the amendment offered by the able Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and myself contains the authority in the Director of Manpower to employ labor for the purpose of supplying labor deficiencies wherever they may exist. It gives him the power to fix the compensation of such labor, with due regard to the value of the individual worker and the competitive-labor-market condition with which the Manpower Director has to compete.

I realize that we run afoul of an emotional attitude on the part of farmers when we start talking about a subsidy, even for labor. In my State the impasse is so difficult that the only solution of the problem, to prevent thousands of acres of vegetables from rotting in the fields, seems to be to bring in labor from Nassau and Jamaica. The producers are almost 100 percent in favor of such action. I have been reluctant to embrace that principle. I am an American citizen. I do not want to see foreign labor brought into this country to compete with our own labor, except as a last resort. I have been subjected to rather severe

criticism by the growers because I have been reluctant to agree to the importation of foreign labor. Some say that labor from Puerto Rico where the situation is so acute and poverty so severe, should be brought into this country. Those of our people who profess some knowledge of the situation in Puerto Rico have said that Puerto Ricans do not speak our language sufficiently well to be effective farm workers. They study English in the schools but it is something like our students studying a foreign language. It is all right theoretically, but one cannot get along very well when he is called upon to speak the language. The growers in Florida have used Nassau labor before. They used it during the First World War. That labor speaks the English language. It is accustomed to the cultivation and harvesting of such important crops as tomatoes, which we grow. There is great skill involved in knowing what tomatoes to pick and what not to pick. It is said that this type of labor has that skill. The growers say they are willing to pay a fair wage for this labor.

Mr. President, my embarrassment can be understood. When I say that we prefer to use our domestic labor the growers say that the program which the Government has followed has been a pitiful failure. The Farm Security Administration has had it under its jurisdiction. It tried to bring workers to Florida from other States. Unhappily, some of them had objectionable diseases before they got there. Some of the growers told me that repeatedly they had to send men to doctors for treatment. Unhappily, the men had not been examined before being taken from their home States. Some of them took advantage of the opportunity of having their expenses paid to Florida, remained there for a few days, and then went back, like tourists. Some were itinerant preachers, others itinerant gamblers, and there may have been characters of lesser virtue in the group which has flowed in. Naturally, the growers have been dissatisfied with that kind of labor.

Mr. President, if I am not able to show them that our own Government has worked out an effective labor policy which will assure them a supply of labor when the Government is calling upon them to produce and meet production schedules established by the Secretary of Agriculture, who is the Food Administrator, how can I defend against a plausible proposal like the importation of foreign labor?

It seems to me that the great difficulty with our whole war program is that too often we have approached it piece-meal, just as my able friend proposes to deal with the problem of furnishing labor to agriculture in his amendment.

I venture, therefore, to attempt to delay the consideration of the pending bill for only a few minutes. Of course we are to vote on it today. I am proposing a concrete and affirmative program on the subject, and I am grateful to the Senate for being good enough to consider it.

This is essentially what my substitute amendment provides. I read from section 2:

There is hereby created a Committee on Requirements and Program (referred to in this act as the "Committee") under the chairmanship of a Director of War Mobilization to be appointed by the President (referred to in this act as the "Director") and consisting of the Secretaries of War and Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Food Administrator, and the Director of Economic Stabilization. This committee shall establish, subject to review and modification by the President, a national program for maximum mobilization of manpower for the military forces and for military and essential civilian production (referred to in this act as the "program"). The program shall take the form of a detailed schedule of military and essential civilian production and specific quotas of manpower to be made available to the military forces and to particular categories of military and civilian production. In preparing the program the committee shall take into account schedules of military and essential civilian production furnished by the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Food Administrator according to appropriate jurisdiction, statements of manpower requirements for the military forces furnished by the War and Navy Departments, and statements of manpower requirements for military and essential civilian production furnished by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and determined by him in cooperation with the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Food Administrator. The quotas of manpower to be made available to the military forces as determined under the program shall supersede present quotas employed under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. The schedules of military and essential civilian production and the manpower quotas relating thereto determined under the program shall be binding upon the War Production Board, the Food Administration, the War Manpower Commission, the Office of Economic Stabilization, and other war agencies on their determination and operations relating to production and manpower.

In conjunction with that section I now read section 7:

There is hereby created a Board of War Mobilization under the chairmanship of the Director and consisting of four representatives of agriculture, four representatives of industry, four representatives of labor, and four public members at large appointed by the President. The Board shall hold regular meetings at least once a month. The Board shall make to the Director and the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Director of Economic Stabilization, and the Food Administrator all of whom shall advise and consult with the Board on all major policies of manpower mobilization, such recommendations relating to policy and operation as it may deem will improve production and manpower mobilization.

Let me briefly discuss those two sections.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It seems obvious to me that what the Senator has read lays down an appropriate over-all rule as the basis for fixing quotas.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what it is intended to do.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida if there is any necessity for a law to achieve that purpose, or has there been any necessity for it in the past 12 months? Could not the President have done precisely that which is provided for in the amendment if he had taken over-all command of the manpower problem?

Mr. PEPPER. No doubt the President had the power to put such a program into effect. Yet, in recent months, at least, the Congress has been addressing itself to these problems directly. We all know that decisions have been made. We all understand from the press that the President has appointed a group of distinguished men who are considering the question of manpower. I do not know what authority the President has delegated to them. I do not know whether they have authority to re-examine the size of the Army and Navy as proposed, or the size of other services as proposed. I do not know what mandate they have been given by Executive order. However, I think the Congress might, with perfect propriety, create a statutory body upon whom the responsibility of making the over-all allocation of manpower would rest pursuant to the authority of the people's Congress.

Here in the Senate we have heard able Senators speak of the size of the armed services. I do not know whether or not the proposed army is too large. I do not know whether such forces are essential to the prosecution of the war. I do not know whether, when the quotas were fixed, the needs of manpower on the farms and in industry were taken into consideration adequately. However, I do know that if Congress should designate the agencies to which I have referred in this amendment as the over-all authority to decide that question, with the congressional admonition that they take into account civilian needs, surely the matter would be put squarely into the hands of those who ought to know how to decide the problem.

The armed services are represented. The head of the War Production Board is represented. The Food Administrator is represented. The Director of Economic Stabilization is a member and the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission would be a member of the board. So we have a committee of service and civilian representatives which could, by the admonition of the Congress, reconsider the matter and see whether or not any determinations previously made are correct in the light of the knowledge which now exists, and the needs which face the country today.

I cannot see why anybody should object to the personnel of the proposed board, unless it is desired to add others: The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations of the Navy, and the representatives of the other civilian agencies to which I have referred would be members of the board. For the first time the Congress itself would say that the Nation's manpower, like the Nation's critical materials, must be fairly allocated among the Nation's

needs. Today that declaration is not upon the statute books of this country as a congressional policy.

If the proposed committee should fail to carry out the mandate of Congress, it would be a failure of duty on the part of the executive department, and not a failure on the part of Congress, to make proper provision for a decision being made. I venture to say that it would be much fairer for this kind of a board to make the over-all decision than for the Senate or the House or any of our committees to make it. At best we are limited in our experience, background, and horizon of knowledge. However, collectively these men are prosecuting the war, and they are responsible for maintaining production in industry, upon the farms, and in other essential activities of the Nation. It seems to me that those who think the Army is too large, and those who think that the administration has not accurately weighed the necessities of agriculture, for example, would favor such an over-all board as the one which I propose.

That is not being achieved by the amendment of my able friend the Senator from Alabama. He is not setting up any over-all board. There is none proposed, so far as I know, except by the Austin-Wadsworth bill, virtuous as it is in some respects; but to it I am opposed at the present time because it embodies the principle of coercion, and I want to avoid until the last resort the necessity of coercion of our civilian population. For obviously to send a man to the service of his country in his Nation's uniform and at a statutory compensation is one thing, but to send a worker to the field or factory of a man who makes a profit upon that operation and his labor without many, many safeguards surrounding that assignment is contrary to what is the very basic principle of democracy—civil rights. What I am trying to avoid is the necessity that we shall wake up to some day—of meeting chaos and confusion in some stern way, and then the proponents of coercion will hold out that the alternative is the coercion which they propose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have followed with a great deal of interest and much sympathy what the Senator has been saying, but is it not obvious from what he has just now said that the amendment he proposes to the pending bill is, like the pending bill itself, part of the whole large problem which is now under consideration in the Committee on Military Affairs which is studying the so-called Austin-Wadsworth bill?

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to answer my able friend and the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming by saying "yes"; and let me say that I have already advised the able sponsor of the amendment to which mine is addressed as a substitute that my first motion will be that the pending amendment be a substitute for the amendment, as modified, of the able Senator from Alabama, and my second motion, if the first is not agreed

to, will be to refer the Bankhead amendment back to the Committee on Military Affairs for further consideration of the whole subject which is now being regarded by it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am very glad to have the Senator make that statement because I believe that is the only sensible procedure to take; because we cannot possibly deal with one aspect after another. That is the trouble at this hour. For over a year we have seen the problem of war manpower creep up on us, but we have not taken an over-all course to solve the whole problem.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator. He simply echoes my own sentiments.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point.

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am sure that the Senator from Wyoming recalls that one of the sponsors of the so-called Austin-Wadsworth bill stated to our committee that it would be absolutely impossible to enact it into legislation and have it effective before January 1, 1944. Of course the Bankhead bill is dealing with the present crop. If the Austin-Wadsworth bill is finally enacted on January 1, 1944, it will supersede all legislation that is enacted at any previous time. The Senate Military Affairs Committee, having that knowledge and basing their action upon the fact that the Austin-Wadsworth bill would not be effective for a long, long time, brought out the Bankhead bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator for that statement. In trying to meet that contingency, I have first offered this alternative. Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to show what affirmative good might come from the pending substitute if the Senate in its wisdom were to adopt it. I have referred to the first paragraph of it, namely, to establish an over-all principle of having a proper determination, by a competent committee whose status is established by the Congress itself, of the way the manpower resources of the Nation should be allocated. That is the first step.

Here is the second step—the one which will accomplish everything the amendment of the able Senator from Alabama will accomplish, and will do no injustice to any man or to any class of our citizenry already in service. I am referring to section 3, on page 3:

Sec. 3. The Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Any provision of this act to the contrary notwithstanding—

"(1) whenever the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission deems it necessary in order to meet the program determined in accordance with section 2 of the Manpower Mobilization Act—

That means the program determined upon by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff, the Chief of Naval Operations—those are the heads of the military services—the Chair-



man of the War Production Board, the Chairman of the Manpower Commission, and the Food Administrator—

That occupational deferments be granted to persons engaged in military or essential civilian production or in essential activity related thereto, he shall make a finding—

And, Mr. President, at that point I ask unanimous consent to perfect my amendment by adding the words "subject to review by the President."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The Senator has the right, of course, to perfect or modify his own amendment; and it will be modified accordingly.

Mr. PEPPER. I continue to read:

To this effect and such findings shall be conclusive upon all civilian local boards and any other civilian agencies functioning under this act. No other occupational deferments shall be granted under this act except upon such a finding by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

(2) For purposes of making an individual finding as to occupational deferment, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is empowered, subject to direction by the President, to employ the officers or employees of the War Manpower Commission or of any other Federal agency and to establish such additional organization and procedure as he shall deem necessary and proper.

Mr. President, that section—those two subdivisions—would accomplish every worthy thing which the amendment of the able senior Senator from Alabama would accomplish, namely, the occupational deferment of every man adjudicated to be necessary in agriculture, or in industry for that matter; and the War Manpower Authority would have the power, and by the principle of this bill would have the duty, to file an appropriate certificate requiring such deferment. He has the power to delegate his authority, for example, to a county agricultural agent or, for example, to the local representative of the Food Administrator in a given county, and to set up as his advisory committee a group of farmers, for example, well acquainted with the agricultural needs of a given area; and if that group, that authority, determines that a boy eligible for service in the services were needed upon the farm, they would have the power to require the boy's deferment by simply filing a certificate to that effect. But if they found out that the boy, although living on the farm, was not personally entitled to deferment, they would not, we presume, file such a certificate.

So, therefore, everything in the way of deferment of agricultural workers which should be done and could be done under the amendment of the able senior Senator from Alabama therefore becomes possible under the substitute which the able senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and I have ventured to offer.

Therefore we do not have to wait until January 1944, I say to the able Senator from Colorado. We can accomplish exactly what the able senior Senator from Alabama desires to have accomplished, that is to say, not leave the question of agricultural deferment up to the draft boards, but put it in the hands of the

Food Administrator and his subordinates, and in that way not one needed worker will be taken from the farm, nor will there be left there a boy who in duty and conscience should go to his country's service.

A farm boy seeks no preference over his neighbors, and I am not willing to give him one unless his individual situation deserves and requires it; and I do not see why the Congress should want to require him to become the object of criticism and question by his neighbors and his comrades who some day will come back to be neighbors with him again, unless the community is satisfied that the situation in that boy's individual family and home is such as to make it fair to the Nation and to him and to his comrades that he stay behind and till the soil, instead of putting on his country's uniform and going forth to perform the defense of his country.

So why should the Congress wish to prefer a blanket deferment to some sensible principle like that, which is the very essence of the whole Selective Service System?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask him a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the able senior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It seems to me that the Senator is just 1,000 percent sound up to the present point. I happen to be one of those who are very reluctant to launch upon occupational deferments and group deferments. I am also one of those who recognize the fact that under the present administration of the draft law there has been precipitated a farm problem which must be met in respect to labor and which can no longer be left to the mercy of what we may call inadequate administration. It seems to me that up to this point the Senator offers a completely adequate substitute which would achieve the farm result without invading the dubious field of occupational deferment.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Now I ask the Senator why he does not, at least for the time being, stop at that point, instead of bringing in, no matter how worthy it may inherently be, a controversial postscript which might well be deferred.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator refer to section 5, the one relative to recruiting workers?

Mr. VANDENBERG. I refer to the purpose of creating the National Emergency Workers Corps.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what I thought. I have given very serious consideration to what the able Senator has said, and I was already practically disposed toward the suggestion which he makes. I do realize that up to this point I cannot see why anybody would object to having an over-all determination of those needs by competent authorities, and having an individual deferment of the men by a competent agency.

I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to delete from the substitute which has been offered and which is now the pending amendment section 5 thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has the right to delete any portion of his proposed substitute.

Mr. PEPPER. I also ask unanimous consent to delete section 6 which is necessarily a part of section 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Florida will be modified as requested by him.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Is it not a fact that the members of the commission or board which has been designated, or a majority of them at least, have already passed upon the allocations of manpower?

Mr. PEPPER. I will say to the able Senator that, in the way they would pass upon it under the terms of this proposal, no. In the first place they have never been an agency of the Congress; in the second place, so far as I know they have never sat down around a table by admonition of Congress to resurvey this whole question in the light of the facts as they now exist. The Senator will understand that in this amendment there is given to them the power to review the decisions which have already been arrived at by the armed services as to the number of men required for military service.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I understand the situation, there never heretofore has been any requirement of a united recommendation covering the over-all manpower problem.

Mr. PEPPER. That is true.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The President could have required it, but he did not do so.

Mr. PEPPER. That statement is confirmed, I will say to the able Senator from Michigan, by the fact that the President now has another able group consisting of some of the most distinguished men in the Government and in the Nation, but, at the same time, the group which is making the decision, as the able Senator will recall, is made up, I believe, of former Justice Byrnes, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, possibly, Admiral Leahy, and I believe by Judge Rosenman.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And I beg the Senator not to ignore Mr. Harry Hopkins.

Mr. PEPPER. And Mr. Harry Hopkins. The gentlemen named constitute the group of five who are considering this whole subject anew. The President has chosen to have a review of this subject by a competent agency. Why cannot Congress have a review of the subject by a competent agency, every one of whom has been appointed by the President himself? Therefore, how could there be any possible objection to the Congress saying, "We should like a reconsideration of this whole question by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the head of the War Production Board, the Food Administrator, the War Manpower Commission Chairman, and the Director of Economic Stabilization? I do not know

of any more competent agency that could be selected than that.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And with the directive that quotas must be reorganized on the basis of the joint determination by all the responsible administrators of the Government.

Mr. PEPPER. Exactly. Then the amendment would admonish them to do that with knowledge of the situation as it now exists, regardless of what they previously may have adjudicated. They would pass upon the matter in the light of the knowledge of facts as they now exist.

Therefore, Mr. President, it would seem to me that the able Senator from Alabama and those who are in favor of the occupational deferment of farm labor could find in such a provision everything they hope to achieve, and at the same time not offend the whole core and heart of the selective-service principle of every man having his own case passed upon in accordance with the justice of the particular case.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I will not interrupt the Senator from Florida again.

Mr. PEPPER. I welcome the Senator's interruptions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. But if he will allow me, I should like to say that he has now put his substitute in a form which I am very happy to support.

Mr. PEPPER. I am very grateful to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President—

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to invite the Senator's attention to section 4, page 4, where the Senator under the terms of his proposal would authorize the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to provide equipment, transportation, and so forth—

Now I quote—

to workers being placed in or transferred to war or essential civilian activity.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him there, that was all consistent with sections 5 and 6, which I have already deleted from the amendment. I thank the Senator for the reminder that that also should be deleted. So I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to delete section 4 as well from the amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be further modified, as requested by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Now, I wish to call the attention of the Senators to two additional things that appear under section 3. First, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent further to modify the amendment. I should like the attention of the able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I wanted him to know that I had intended to modify the amendment in the following respects, which I wanted the able Senator to observe:

At the appropriate place as the amendment has been modified I would insert:

The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is authorized and directed to survey the need for and the efficiency of use of labor

employed or engaged in production or service, and for these purposes shall have all necessary access to production facilities and information.

That is intended to provide labor inspectors in factories to ascertain whether or not an employer is actually making efficient use of the labor he has employed. We have heard again and again the criticism that shipyards and airplane factories and other war industries have hired more labor than they need, and we thought it was only proper that some representative of the Government manpower agency should have the right of access to such factories, to see whether they are, as a matter of fact, employing and absorbing more labor than they ought to, and whether the employees are working or whether they are idling their time in the factories.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. This morning, when the Senate met, I put into the Record some criticism of the present selective service system by Colonel Griffin, the head of the association of draft boards in the St. Louis metropolitan area. One thing that Colonel Griffin has told me he believes is to some extent responsible for the manpower shortage is the fact that, under the present selective service system, the local board at the home of a man who is registered in the selective service always retains jurisdiction over his case. Colonel Griffin tells me that there are literally thousands upon thousands of men who come into the St. Louis metropolitan area from rural Missouri or rural Illinois or from Arkansas, Mississippi, Alabama, or some other State to obtain jobs, some of which are actually in connection with munition plants, for instance, in the Curtiss-Wright factory or other concerns engaged in war work, but whose actual service to the plant is not essential.

Yet they write back to the local draft board at Lone Ridge, Ark., or some place in Missouri or some place in Illinois and tell the local board that they are working for an essential war industry, such as the Curtiss-Wright plant, and they are thereupon deferred; whereas if the local board in St. Louis had the right to go through those plants they would find men engaged as timekeepers or water carriers, or in other absolutely nonessential work which could be performed just as well by older men or women or disabled men, and the man who was actually performing the work would be eligible for service. Colonel Griffin tells me—and I believe it to be true—that thousands of men who are doing nonessential work, even though it may be in essential war industries, and who are perfectly capable of rendering good military service could be relieved for such service. I have been informed today by Colonel Keesling of the Selective Service that steps are being taken to correct that situation.

The point I make is that it was a matter of administration, and there should have been no necessity for any change in the law. It seems to me the situation

should have been recognized a long time ago and corrected under the present law by the Selective Service Administration.

Mr. PEPPER. I am sure that the principle I have tried to suggest, namely, the utilization of labor inspectors, is very widely employed in England. Under their set-up they have inspectors going to the plants and factories and picking up just such information as the able Senator from Missouri has pointed out concerning men who are being deferred but who ought not to be deferred. The inspectors thereupon notify the appropriate draft board of the man that he should be eligible for service.

Mr. President, there is a converse case to the one the able Senator from Missouri has pointed out, which has been called to my attention from several sources; that is, there will be boys from Florida, let us say, who will be working in Chattanooga in some kind of a war factory. Those boys will be actively engaged in essential war work, but when the draft board in Florida has its quota to fill, it is sometimes reluctant to honor the deferment of such a boy who is up in Chattanooga, and send the boys who are at home off to war. Sometimes they do disservice to industry by not deferring when they should defer, which has, to my personal knowledge, led a great many industries to hire men to do nothing except go around all over the country and see the draft boards about deferment. These men try to explain to the draft boards back home that the men are engaged in essential war work. So it really works both ways.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I recognize that would be another defect fully as bad as the one I have pointed out, and we all recognize that it would be undesirable to allow a man to shop around—that is, to go from a board where his number might be high and put his credentials under another board where his number might be lower in the draft. But it does seem to me that under the existing law there is no excuse for a lack of overall supervision to correct those evils and to bring about the proper utilization of the manpower of this country, to the end that men who should be in the Army should not be deferred, and, on the other hand, that men should be deferred for such essential industries as farming, the production of food for the fighting forces, which to my mind is fully as important as the manufacture of munitions, or, so far as that is concerned, as important as fighting. It seems to me there has been a complete break-down of the over-all supervision.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the able Senator from Missouri assuming that the War Manpower Commission has in its own right authority to defer for occupational reasons?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Selective Service System has, the President has.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; but as I understand, that is an individual matter.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The President of the United States set up the Manpower Commission. There was no stat-



utory provision for the Manpower Commission. The President of the United States set it up, and under his general wartime authority he could have given them any authority he pleased.

Mr. PEPPER. I venture to say that there is some question about that, at least the way it is working now, because I knew of a case recently where, although there had been a request for deferment by the War Manpower Commission, sanctioned by the President, the draft board did not honor the request.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. In just a moment. If the individual affected were to file a request for deferment, and that request were turned down by the local draft board, he could take an appeal, and the President upon appeal could, of course, give the man favorable action, and therefore deferment, upon his own petition. But that power is not, to my knowledge, vested in the War Manpower Commission, or in any other Federal agency.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Will the Senator permit me to read the language of the law?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes, I shall be glad to have it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is paragraph (e) of section 5—

Mr. PEPPER. Of the Selective Service Act?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of the Selective Service Act.

It provides:

The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of those men whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose activity in other endeavors, is found in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

Of course, as the Senator from Missouri has pointed out, the Manpower Commission is a creation of the President, and this is one of the regulations which the President has been given power to make under this very act.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is no doubt right in reference to the possible power of the President, but as the system now operates, the War Manpower Commission, as I believe the able Senator will agree, is not exercising that power.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certainly I agree to that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is the occasion for the proposed legislation.

Mr. PEPPER. But the proposed legislation does not give the War Manpower Commission power to require occupational deferment; it merely creates a blanket deferment by the Congress.

The proposed legislation is not pursuant to the directive of the President, or the power of the President. It is not proposed that the President's power be actually employed by the Manpower Commission. The proposal is merely to set up a blanket statutory deferment, which would not solve anything, including the labor problem.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator's last proposed amendment causes me some concern. As I understand, it would, under the authority of the proposal, authorize the creation of a corps of inspectors who could enter into factories, let us say everywhere, to ascertain whether or not proper use of the available manpower was being made within those factories. Am I correct in that understanding?

Mr. PEPPER. It was intended not to direct, but to authorize the War Manpower Commission to do it, because it was felt that there should be some way of determining whether an employer was making a reasonably efficient use of his labor. Does the Senator think that is not a wise suggestion?

Mr. DANAHER. I think it is not, if the Senator will let me answer the question categorically, and proceed to ask the Senator if he has made inquiry to ascertain whether or not the division of factory inspection in the Department of Labor is not now already equipped to do the very thing he proposes?

Mr. PEPPER. I did not realize that they were to do it upon quite the same background as my proposal would authorize the War Manpower Commission to do it. I was influenced largely by England's experience in connection with these labor inspectors. A few days ago I was talking to the head of a steel firm in Cleveland and I mentioned this suggestion about labor inspectors. He said, "I think that is an excellent suggestion. It is only fair that employers do make efficient use of their labor."

Let me call attention to something which happened in my State a few days ago, or so I am told. I do not mean to charge the employer with the facts unless they exist. I was told that a shipmaker put a notice in the paper that he was going to pay skilled wages for semiskilled labor and semiskilled wages for unskilled labor. The result was that several thousand workers poured out of other war industries in that community into this man's shipyard. He put them all to work, kept them on the pay roll a week or 10 days or 2 weeks, then screened them, turned off all the poorer workers, taking the whole number as it then existed, and had an improved labor supply when he got through. Yet he demoralized labor conditions in his community.

Somehow or other it seems to me that kind of thing should be prevented. If there were an admonition on the part of Congress to the War Manpower Commission to require every one who is using labor to make reasonable use of it, at least before he can take on other labor, I think it would be in the interest of the economical use of the Nation's manpower.

If I am wrong about that, in the consensus of Senators, I should be very glad to leave this suggested provision out of the amendment, because I do not want controversial questions brought into the amendment.

Mr. DANAHER. I think we are striving for the same common objective. If in fact what the Senator seeks to achieve is being done or can be done by existing authority, I am sure the Senator has no desire to provide for an additional corps of inspectors.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not. If the Senator feels that there is another agency of the Government adequately covering this field, I shall ask to withdraw the proposal I have just offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has that right.

Mr. PEPPER. Let me direct the able Senator's attention to another amendment which I desire to offer to my amendment providing:

The Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is authorized and directed to develop programs and provide medical care and other assistance for rehabilitating persons deferred from military training and service because of physical disability.

My reason for venturing to bring that up for consideration is that the number of selectees rejected through January 1943 amounted to 2,542,626. Those inducted through selective service numbered 4,054,000. Those who volunteered through selective service numbered 2,217,000. The total of the two references I have just given amounted to 6,271,000. About 30 percent were rejected for physical reasons.

Dr. Parran was before our committee, and in speaking on this subject he testified that except for certain venereal cases, all but a few hundred of all those rejected for physical reasons had been rehabilitated for service, and therefore made eligible, many a father having to go to war today in this country, and leave his wife and children, because of illiteracy and because of physical deficiencies which have required deferment. In many cases, Dr. Parran testified, the physical defects could be removed and men rejected made eligible for military service.

If Senators think that is a controversial subject, that it might get into the question of the means, I do not want to inject it into the consideration.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator's latest objective is obviously highly worthy, but it seems to me that it opens up the entire subject of civilian rehabilitation, concerning which there is a very desperate controversy.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will stick to what he has, he has a simple proposition, namely, a congressional directive for an over-all agreement among responsible Government heads for an appropriate allocation of our total manpower, and authority to the Manpower Commission even to defer occupational groups if ultimately that is necessary in order to meet the quotas. Let us stop right there.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It is just as simple as can be.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have practically concluded what I wished to say. So far as I am concerned, unless other Senators are disposed to discuss the question, I am ready for a vote on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to ask for a quorum call, and have an opportunity thereafter for 5 minutes to explain the present status of the amendment, and then I am disposed to have a vote on it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish to ask the Senator about section 7 of the amendment. I have not heard the Senator withdraw that yet.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; I thought I did.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Section 7 is out?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if I have not already requested the privilege of deleting section 7, I now make that request.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What sections are left?

Mr. PEPPER. That leaves only sections 2 and 3, Mr. President, and they should appropriately, of course, be numbered sections 1 and 2. I ask that the amendment be modified in that respect, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

Mr. PEPPER. Unless some other Senator wishes to address himself on the subject matter I would like to suggest the absence of a quorum. Did the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] wish to speak?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like an opportunity for a brief explanation of the amendment after a quorum call shall be had, and before there is a vote on it, in order to advise Members of the Senate what is in the amendment as it is now modified.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. Has there been an agreement with respect to allocation of time to a point that if I should speak at this time I would be trespassing upon the time of some other Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There has been no agreement as to the allocation of time.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, there is a related phase of this whole war manpower problem which, it seems to me, might best be high-lighted by my taking an actual case history which I have very carefully sought to authenticate in its every aspect. Under date of January 15, I received from the Forsberg Manufacturing Co., of Bridgeport, Conn., a letter which set forth that under date of December 10, 1942, the Navy Department had opened negotiation No. 2386, which called for the manufacture of 311,800 hacksaw frames. The letter complained to me that this particular firm was the lowest bidder of all those submitting bids throughout the country for this particular negotiation, notwithstanding which it was denied the contract on the ground that Bridgeport, Conn., had been classified by the War Manpower Commission

to be a critical labor area, and therefore that no contract could be allocated to the Forsberg Manufacturing Co. within that area.

Let us stop right there for a moment, Mr. President, while we ask ourselves exactly what that means to the Forsberg Manufacturing Co. I have had reported to me prior and similar instances of concerns which had been the lowest bidders within a given critical manpower area, but which were denied the contracts. As a result, being unable to obtain any materials with which to engage in normal civilian production, and being unable to secure any war contracts because of the critical labor area ruling, the individual concern simply had to go out of business, and all its personnel, its labor pool, had to be dissipated to other factories and other industries within the area. I feared that might happen to the Forsberg Co.

In order to authenticate the facts, I sent the company's letter to the Navy Department, and under date of February 4 I received from Mr. James Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, a letter identifying the particular negotiation and the correspondence, and I quote from it:

The facts as presented by the company to you are correct.

The decision of the Navy Department in this particular case was controlled by Directive No. 2 of the War Production Board as amended October 10, 1942, which ordered the armed services not to place contracts in areas designated as group 1 by the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. President, one can see the limits to which the War Manpower Commission authority extends when it can say that within a given area the supply of labor is deemed to be inadequate to meet the demand either currently or within the following 6 months, and that consequently no war contract may be let within that area.

The War Production Board, through its Allocations Section, Mr. President, is bound by the certification of the War Manpower Commission. Consequently the Navy, Mr. Forrestal went on to advise, had to search for and discover another manufacturing company which could supply the particular hacksaw frames. It made no difference that the concern receiving the contract submitted a bid which was higher, or that the company was located a thousand miles away; so long as the company which was the lowest bidder is within a critical manpower area, it cannot have the contract, and the Navy, under the War Manpower Commission's directive, must place the contract elsewhere.

That certainly presented an interesting situation. So I took the matter up with the War Production Board and asked their advice as to what the situation was as W. P. B. saw it, and under date of February 12 I received a letter, from which I will read in part:

Your recent letter outlining the problem of the Forsberg Manufacturing Co., in Bridgeport, Conn., was discussed at a recent meeting of the Critical Labor Area Appeals Board. This Board is composed of representatives of the War Manpower Commission and of the Procurement Policy Division, the Smaller War

Plants Division, and the Labor Production Division of the War Production Board, who are engaged in a continuous study of the effect of present procurement policies in critical labor areas.

A summary of the Board's conclusions to date indicates that the basic problem is to use the manufacturing skill, ingenuity, and equipment found in critical labor areas to make the maximum impact against the enemy. The power of this impact should not be dissipated in producing items which can be readily secured in other sections of the country where they have ample facilities and labor surpluses. One exemption has already been made for small business since it is realized that small business is an essential part of our war and peace economy.

The suggested procedure outlined in your letter would make another exemption, after investigation, for firms able to produce the goods mentioned in the contract without further burden on the local labor market.

Mr. President, I digress at this point to say that I had suggested, in effect, that the local representative of the War Production Board should make inquiry within the area to ascertain whether or not the successful bidder in fact had an ample labor pool, in fact had machinery and industrial ability sufficient to execute the contract, and could make delivery on time. If all those conditions existed, and if the company could deliver on time, that is exactly what the Navy or any other procurement arm actually desired. So, it seemed to me that if the execution of the contract could be accomplished without impact adversely on the labor supply in the given area, why not let the War Production Board agent on the ground ascertain the facts and certify accordingly?

The War Production Board advised with reference to that suggestion:

This would increase the amount of business coming into a critical labor area after consideration of the labor requirements of individual manufacturers, but without consideration of the labor demands of the man across the street. A critical labor area is, by definition, an area in which there are more jobs than men; an area in which the maximum in-migration has already occurred with resulting strain on housing and transportation facilities. The Board believes it impossible for a manufacturer to guarantee that his labor will remain constant during a given contract, for no manufacturer can control the action of the local draft boards.

I will digress again, Mr. President, to say that that is the weakest point in the entire chain, because if such an argument can be applied as to deny a contract to the low bidder, the same argument certainly applies to the successful higher bidder who ultimately obtains the contract.

I resume reading the letter:

As Selective Service pulls a worker out of a plant, replacements must come from the more efficient use of present employees; or additional labor must be obtained from the unemployed, from new workers such as women and high-school graduates coming into the market, or from the transfer of workers from less essential work to the more essential work of war production.

Mr. President, I shall not read the remainder of the letter, which deals with a completely different aspect of the situation; but, equipped with the views of the War Production Board, and finding that



the War Manpower Commission was, after all, the key to the whole problem, I took the matter up with the War Manpower Commission, and under date of February 26 Mr. Paul V. McNutt wrote:

Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of February 6, with which you enclose a copy of one of January 15, 1943, from President H. S. Forsberg of the above company, protesting the classification by the War Manpower Commission of Bridgeport as a critical labor-shortage area.

I believe that the following information, together with the attached news release, will be responsive to Mr. Forsberg's comment, and will explain both to you and to him the position of the War Manpower Commission in matters of this kind.

In collaboration with the War Production Board, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, the Maritime Commission, and other interested groups, and on a basis of careful analysis of labor-market conditions, the War Manpower Commission has certified which labor-market areas have the greatest abundance of workers together with those in which labor shortages now exist and those in which shortages are anticipated. Factual information for our purposes is gathered by the extensive field organization of the Commission, and includes present and future demand for workers expressed to us through the United States Employment Service by employers in each area, with additional data from the Selective Service as to withdrawals that will be made from the area.

The estimated supply of workers is based on the number presently registered with the Employment Service, plus estimate of additional workers normally in the labor market but not registered, and those who could be attracted into the labor market by intensive recruiting campaigns.

Since our reports will be revised each month, changes in the situation in a given area will be subject to review at each monthly report. The facts entering into our certification in respect to these areas have been discussed with local representatives of both management and labor.

In conformity with these certifications, recommendations are made for the assigning of contracts in order to mobilize our total labor resources for the war effort into localities, wherever possible, in which resident labor now has little or no opportunity to contribute to the war program. To do otherwise would compound the already serious problems we have of expanding community facilities of housing, schools and utilities because of in-migration of workers in excess of the capacity of the community to absorb them. On the other hand, it is only fair, as well as in the interest of efficiency, to assign these war contracts to cities and areas which now have facilities for such work and wherein is found a surplus of workers who are willing and anxious to do their share, but thus far for one reason or another have either been overlooked or unable to participate.

We all greatly regret that this or any action of governmental agencies should result in financial or economic loss to any individual, firm, or city. However, I know of no means for wholly avoiding such disturbances of normal life and conditions which are due only to the war.

Sincerely,

PAUL V. McNUTT, Chairman.

Mr. President, the picture set up in this file bears markedly on the issue raised by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. The problem is related also to the arguments which have been made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and

other Senators. We have yet to find an appropriate solution for the threat to our economy when a successful and thriving industry, so efficiently operated that it is, in fact, the lowest bidder on a procurement contract, can not only be deprived of the opportunity to be awarded the contract, but, after having spent a lifetime in training its workers, must see them dispersed into a labor pool to be trained again in new tasks by another industry while the erstwhile employing concern becomes a war casualty. It is a striking situation, Mr. President. Mr. McNutt concludes his letter with expressions of regret that such a war casualty must result, and that he knows of no means of avoiding such disturbances. It does not seem fair.

In the little town of Berlin, Conn., there was a company called the Prentice Manufacturing Co. It made nothing but Talon zippers. It was the low bidder on a Government contract. The company did not receive the contract because it was located in a critical labor area. Someone downtown not known to you or me decides that somewhere else, in some other community, there is a labor pool available to manufacture Talon zippers; so the Prentice Co., with its 650 employees, must fold up and its employees must be absorbed into some other war industries, perhaps many miles away, while the Prentice Co., the low bidder, becomes a war casualty.

I have in mind a concern in Hartford, Conn., which in January of this year lost a \$21,000,000 contract under circumstances identical with those which I have described. That there is need, in solving the war manpower problem, for a greater utilization of all affected departments and a more efficient coordination of them in their demands upon the available labor pool becomes apparent. Whether we could achieve it under the proposal of the Senator from Florida, I do not know, but it strikes in the right direction. It is high time that there should be greater coordination among the authorities who are charged with the responsibility of organizing our economy for war-time production.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in full in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the letters from which I have read, in order that the entire case file may appear in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FORSBERG MANUFACTURING Co.,  
Bridgeport, Conn., January 15, 1943.  
Hon. JOHN A. DANAHER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We feel you will be interested in our experience in bidding on a Navy Department bid, and we would appreciate any assistance you can give us in connection with it.

This was bid, negotiation No. 2386, which opened December 10, 1942, at 10 a. m., on an item of "Frames, hacksaw."

The total quantity was 311,800 frames, and we bid from 26 to 28 cents each, depending upon point of delivery, so that we were the lowest bidder on the contract. In

addition, the deliveries specified in bid were guaranteed by us when we quoted.

Nevertheless, we have been informed that because Bridgeport is in the "black" area as regards manpower, we will not be awarded the contract and it will be given to another bidder.

In view of the fact that we have the manpower to make delivery on the contract, the necessary equipment and facilities, and the item of hacksaw frames is a standard one with us, as we have been making this item for the past 25 years, we feel we are being penalized by being denied this contract, simply because some other manufacturers are overloaded with war work.

We contacted the local War Production Board office, and, upon explaining the situation to them, found their reaction was the same as ours in that the order prohibiting the letting of any contracts to Bridgeport is too general. It is felt that when a Bridgeport manufacturer bids, if he is the lowest bidder, a check should be made with him or the local War Production Board to see that he can deliver, instead of automatically awarding the contract to a bidder in another city.

Your consideration of this situation will be sincerely appreciated, as we are most anxious to be awarded this contract for hacksaw frames, and will hope for an early response from you.

Yours very truly,

H. S. FORSBERG,  
President.

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,  
Washington, February 4, 1943.  
The Honorable JOHN A. DANAHER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DANAHER: Negotiation No. 2386, which you called to our attention in your letter of January 18, 1943, and in which the Forsberg Manufacturing Co. was denied a contract because its plant was located in an area of acute labor shortage, has been reviewed by this office.

The facts as presented by the company to you, are correct.

The decision of the Navy Department in this particular case was controlled by directive No. 2 of the War Production Board, as amended October 10, 1942, which ordered the armed services not to place contracts in areas designated as group I by the War Manpower Commission.

In its release of December 3, 1942, the War Manpower Commission states as follows: "Group I—Areas in which the supply of labor is inadequate to meet the demand, currently or within the ensuing 6 months. Further supply contracts should not be awarded in these areas if facilities for meeting the requirements of such contracts are available in other areas."

Acting in accordance with these instructions, the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts searched for and discovered another manufacturing company which had facilities and could supply the frames. This company had already bid on the contract, but its bid was slightly higher than the bid of the Forsberg Manufacturing Co. The price was renegotiated down to the amount of the lowest bid. The contract was awarded to the company which had the facilities and was not located in a group I area.

The above action by the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts was entirely consistent with existing War Production Board instructions. Other companies in group I areas have entered complaints similar to that of the Forsberg Manufacturing Co., and accumulated criticisms have been presented to the War Production Board through its Procurement Policy Board for consideration relative

to a possible liberalization of the current directive. Pending further action on the part of the War Production Board, the Navy Department will continue to follow existing instructions.

We appreciate very much your interest in bringing this case to our attention, for it is just through such means that we are able to make representations to the War Manpower Commission and the War Production Board so that these problems can be solved.

In accordance with your wish, I am returning the letter from the Forsberg Manufacturing Co.

Sincerely,

JAMES FORRESTAL,  
Under Secretary of the Navy.

FEBRUARY 6, 1943.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,

Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: The Forsberg Manufacturing Co. in Bridgeport, Conn., bid on negotiation No. 2386, opening December 10, 1942, and was the lowest bidder. The contract, however, was awarded to a higher bidder. The company advises that the local War Production Board officials seemed to agree with the bidder that the War Manpower Commission order prohibiting the letting of any contracts to Bridgeport is too general, and apparently your local office feels that a check could be made with the local board to ascertain whether or not a given bidder can deliver in accordance with the specifications of the negotiation rather than have Washington automatically award the contract to a higher bidder in some other city. I took the matter up with the Navy Department, which advises that the facts set forth by the Forsberg Manufacturing Co. are correct.

Apparently, then, the whole matter turns on a question of policy, and I will very greatly appreciate whatever comments you are in position to give me as to the basic problem.

Faithfully yours,

JOHN A. DANAHER.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,

Washington, D. C., February 12, 1943.

Hon. JOHN A. DANAHER,  
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR DANAHER: Your recent letter outlining the problem of the Forsberg Manufacturing Co., in Bridgeport, Conn., was discussed at a recent meeting of the Critical Labor Area Appeals Board. This board is composed of representatives of the War Manpower Commission and of the Procurement Policy Division, the Smaller War Plants Division, and the Labor Production Division of the War Production Board, who are engaged in a continuous study of the effect of present procurement policies in critical labor areas.

A summary of the board's conclusions to date indicates that the basic problem is to use the manufacturing skill, ingenuity, and equipment found in critical labor areas to make the maximum impact against the enemy. The power of this impact should not be dissipated in producing items which can be readily secured in other sections of the country where they have ample facilities and labor surpluses. One exemption has already been made for small business since it is realized that small business is an essential part of our war and peace economy.

The suggested procedure outlined in your letter would make another exemption, after investigation, for firms able to produce the goods mentioned in the contract without further burden on the local labor market. This would increase the amount of business coming into a critical labor area after consideration of the labor requirements of individual manufacturers, but without consideration of the labor demands of the man across the street. A critical labor area is, by definition, an area in which there are more jobs than men; an area in which the maximum in-migration has already occurred with re-

sulting strain on housing and transportation facilities. The board believes it impossible for a manufacturer to guarantee that his labor will remain constant during a given contract, for no manufacturer can control the action of the local draft boards. As Selective Service pulls a worker out of a plant, replacements must come from the more efficient use of present employees; or additional labor must be obtained from the unemployed, from new workers such as women and high school graduates coming into the market, or from the transfer of workers from less essential work to the more essential work of war production.

To speed up the transfer of workers from less essential to more essential work the War Manpower Commission has already designated a list of occupations whose workers will not be deferred on account of dependency when called by Selective Service. It has furthermore established the 48-hour week in all critical labor areas and has recommended that all hiring of workers in critical labor areas shall be done on a system of job priorities through the local United States Employment Service commencing April 1, 1943.

The Smaller War Plants Division of the War Production Board is attacking the problem from another angle. They have taken two key areas in the State of Connecticut—New Britain and Bridgeport. In both instances they have visited and have a list of all important companies engaged in war production. They have looked at the backlog of orders and the number of additional men each manufacturer will require in the next 6 months. Since no more in-migration is possible, these men must come from other employers in that area or a plan must be devised to share the work. Accordingly, the Smaller War Plants Division examines the requisitions for new critical tools by all companies asking for additional labor. They then compare this requisition with their records of similar machine tools in the area that are not fully engaged in war production. The next step is to wash out the new tool demand by spreading subcontracts on the backlog of orders to those concerns who have similar tools and who are not working at maximum production. After this process is carried out within the area so that every firm in the New Britain or Bridgeport area is working at maximum capacity on prime contracts or subcontracts, it then may be necessary to place any additional backlog in other labor areas which are less critical.

The above procedure will have direct bearing on the problem of the Forsberg Manufacturing Co. I am advised that the Smaller War Plants Division is working on their particular problem. You will be interested to learn that last week, after completing a thorough investigation of Tuttle & Bailey, New Britain, the Smaller War Plants Division certified them to the Navy as prime contractors.

Yours very truly,

TUDOR BOWEN,  
Deputy Director.

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,  
February 6, 1943.

MR. PAUL V. McNUTT,  
Chairman, War Manpower Commission,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. McNUTT: Under date of January 15, Mr. H. S. Forsberg, president of the Forsberg Manufacturing Co., Bridgeport, Conn., wrote me pointing up the very difficult situation now confronting many plants in so-called critical areas. I had sent his communication to the Navy Department and now have at hand a reply from Mr. James Forrestal, Under Secretary of the Navy, who says that the facts presented are correct. Apparently, the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts in the Navy is governed in its action by some ruling of the War Manpower Commission.

I shall appreciate having at hand your best advice in this matter, to the end that I might make adequate reply.

Thank you very much for your courtesy and cooperation.

Faithfully yours,

JOHN A. DANAHER.

FORSBERG MANUFACTURING CO.  
BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

OFFICE FOR  
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,  
WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION,  
Washington, D. C., February 26, 1943.

Hon. JOHN A. DANAHER,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of February 6, with which you enclosed a copy of one of January 15, 1943, from President H. S. Forsberg of the above company, protesting the classification by the War Manpower Commission of Bridgeport as a critical labor shortage area.

I believe that the following information, together with the attached news release, will be responsive to Mr. Forsberg's comments and will explain both to you and to him the position of the War Manpower Commission in matters of this kind.

In collaboration with the War Production Board, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, the Maritime Commission and other interested groups, and on a basis of careful analysis of labor market conditions, the War Manpower Commission has certified which labor market areas have the greatest abundance of workers together with those in which labor shortages now exist and those in which shortages are anticipated. Factual information for our purposes is gathered by the extensive field organization of the Commission, and includes present and future demand for workers expressed to us through the United States Employment Service by employers in each area, with additional data from the Selective Service as to withdrawals that will be made from the area. The estimated supply of workers is based on the number presently registered with the Employment Service, plus estimate of additional workers normally in the labor market but not registered, and those who could be attracted into the labor market by intensive recruiting campaigns.

Since our reports will be revised each month, changes in the situation in a given area will be subject to review at each monthly report. The facts entering into our certification in respect to these areas have been discussed with local representatives of both management and labor.

In conformity with these certifications, recommendations are made for the assigning of contracts in order to mobilize our total labor resources for the war effort into localities, wherever possible, in which resident labor now has little or no opportunity to contribute to the war program. To do otherwise would compound the already serious problems we have of expanding community facilities of housing, schools, and utilities because of in-migration of workers in excess of the capacity of the community to absorb them. On the other hand, it is only fair, as well as in the interest of efficiency, to assign these war contracts to cities and areas which now have facilities for such work and wherein is found a surplus of workers who are willing and anxious to do their share, but thus far for one reason or another have either been overlooked or unable to participate.

We all greatly regret that this or any action of governmental agencies should result in financial or economic loss to any individual, firm, or city. However, I know of no means for wholly avoiding such disturbances of normal life and conditions which are due only to the war.

Sincerely,

PAUL V. McNUTT,  
Chairman.



Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, what is the pending question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] for the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum for a moment?

Mr. PEPPER. Certainly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida a question relating to section 3 of his proposed substitute, to see if I correctly understand his amendment. As I understand the amendment, in section 2 he sets up a board of officials. Then I find this language in section 3:

(1) whenever the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission deems it necessary in order to meet the program determined in accordance with section 2 of the Manpower Mobilization Act that occupational deferments be granted to persons engaged in military or essential civilian production or in essential activity related thereto, he shall make a finding—

Mr. PEPPER. Pardon me, I inserted the words "subject to review by the President" at that point.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is what I wanted to find out—whether it would make the chairman of the War Manpower Commission the czar of everything.

Mr. PEPPER. No; I asked and received permission to insert at that point the words "subject to review by the President."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Since that proviso has been inserted, I wonder what the objective and effect of the section would be. In the original act the President has already been given that power. Then to restate that he has the power, when it is obvious that he has it, and when the law already states that he has it, makes me wonder what the objective of section 3 is, and I wonder if the Senator will agree to withdraw the section?

Mr. PEPPER. My purpose is to deal with a fact, not a theory. We are dealing with a situation which the President has not already seen fit to provide for—namely occupational deferment by an agency other than the draft boards. Congress, when faced with that problem, would simply be enacting here a provision that the authority is reposed in the chairman of the War Manpower Commission, but we do not, of course, attempt to deprive the President of his power to supervise or review all action of the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yielded to the able Senator from Colorado, and next I will yield to the able Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I just do not understand the necessity for add-

ing that language there. There is nothing mandatory in section 3. I do not see that there is anything mandatory in section 2; but certainly there is nothing mandatory in section 3. If the President does not exercise the powers that we gave him in the original Selective Service Act, I do not understand why the Senator thinks he will exercise those powers under this particular language.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the exercise of the power conferred by this section would not be dependent upon affirmative action by the President. We would impose upon the War Manpower Commission the duty to see to it that proper occupational deferments are brought about. However, we would still leave to the President the power to review the decisions of the War Manpower Commission; but that is quite different from the authority which is vested in the President under the Selective Service Act to do those things affirmatively. The President has not seen fit to do them. The able senior Senator from Alabama has said, therefore, that we should have a blanket deferment of agricultural labor. The able senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and I have proposed as a substitute that we confer a statutory duty and power upon the War Manpower Commission to provide for occupational deferment, but, of course, we have not wished to deprive the President of his just power to review the decisions of the War Manpower Director.

We feel that would make it very much stronger, therefore, that the principal objective of the able senior Senator from Alabama and the able senior Senator from Colorado would be achieved in a way better than that which has been used in the past when we have not done something like this.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. LODGE. As I understand it, the Senator offers sections 2 and 3 as substitutes for the bill; is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. As substitutes for the pending amendment.

Mr. LODGE. Section 2 provides for a convocation or gathering together of the heads of the various war agencies, and provides for the development by them of a plan for allocation of manpower; is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. Of course, I believe the President has that power; but certainly it is a praiseworthy goal, whether done by Presidential authority or by statutory enactment.

Section 3 leads me to the conclusion—and I hope the Senator will correct me if I am wrong—that the determination of occupational deferment would be removed entirely from the hands of the local boards.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct. It does make it the duty of local boards, in respect to occupational deferment, to observe the directive of the War Manpower Commission, which is subject to review by the President. Of course, that

is true only in respect to occupational deferment.

Mr. LODGE. I wish the Senator would tell me what the philosophy behind that is and what the purpose is and what the merit of it is.

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place, that is offered as a substitute for the blanket deferment which is proposed by the able senior Senator from Alabama. In the second place, essentially it provides for the system which, as I understand it, is in vogue in England—that is, there are occupational deferment boards who have the power to provide for and require occupational deferment. It is intended, and presumed, that the occupational deferment boards will be closer in touch with the occupations that they shall deal with than would the draft boards themselves. It is intended that the occupational deferment boards shall pass on the matter of occupational deferment, and that the selective-service boards should pass upon the matter of deferment upon other grounds, as between man and man—questions of dependency, fitness, and other questions of that character.

But certainly, according to my information, the system proposed has been the system used in England, under which they have entrusted the matter of occupational deferment to occupational deferment boards. Since the President's right of review is preserved, it would seem to me that our proposal is much to be preferred over the proposal of the able senior Senator from Alabama, which provides for just a blanket deferment. Our proposal would for the first time make it the duty of the Manpower Commission to enter the field of occupational deferment in his own right but at the same time it would not deprive the President of his supervisory power.

Mr. LODGE. Does the Senator think that the adoption of his amendment would result in there being a really accurate knowledge, somewhere, in some agency of the Government, as to where the labor surplus is and what the nature of it is?

Mr. PEPPER. That is certainly the intention of the amendment, and I think it would go a great deal farther than would the amendment of the able senior Senator from Alabama in achieving that end. That is what should be done.

Mr. LODGE. It seems to me that until we know where the labor surplus is and what the nature of it is, there is not much use in enacting legislation; and, without that knowledge, planning, whether on a voluntary basis or on the basis of coercion, will not accomplish anything.

Mr. PEPPER. It is intended that the over-all board will for the first time, and authoritatively, make that determination and promulgate that knowledge.

Mr. LODGE. I shall not ask the Senator to explain to me why that has not been done, but I think we all have a right to wonder why it has not been done.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator is kind in relieving me of a duty which I could not discharge.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I cannot find the language to do the things which the Senator from Massachusetts has been assured the amendment would do. I cannot find anything in the language which provides for doing such things.

Mr. PEPPER. In the first place, it is made the duty of the committee—referring to the over-all Committee on Requirements and Program—and I read now from page 2, beginning in line 3:

This committee shall establish, subject to review and modification by the President, a national program for maximum mobilization of manpower for the military forces and for military and essential civilian production (referred to in this act as the "program"). The program shall take the form of a detailed schedule of military and essential civilian production and specific quotas of manpower to be made available to the military forces and to particular categories of military and civilian production. In preparing the program the committee shall take into account schedules of military and essential civilian production furnished by the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Food Administrator, according to appropriate jurisdiction, statements of manpower requirements for the military forces furnished by the War and Navy Departments, and statements of manpower requirements for military and essential civilian production furnished by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and determined by him in cooperation with the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Food Administrator. The quotas of manpower to be made available to the military forces as determined under the program shall supersede present quotas employed under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

And so forth. Those things could not be done, let me say to the able senior Senator from Colorado, without a detailed knowledge of the manpower resources of the country, their distribution, and their character.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That may be a sensible conclusion, although I do not concur in it. As I see the program which is listed and provided for in the amendment, the Army, the Navy, the War Production Board, and other agencies would simply set up a program such as that which they have already set up. The armed forces, for instance, require something under 11,000,000 men; the War Production Board has a manpower requirement; agriculture has a manpower requirement of from twelve to thirteen million workers; and so on. That is the program. I do not see where the Senator provides for the making of any survey of the existing manpower supply. He is dealing entirely with the demand for manpower, not the supply of manpower.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the measure does provide for the allocation of the Nation's manpower, and the allocation cannot be made unless the authorities know what the supply is. We cannot divide up critical materials unless we know what we have to divide up.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. FERGUSON. Does this amendment anticipate new local boards on deferment along industrial occupational lines?

Mr. PEPPER. Not primarily.

Mr. FERGUSON. How is that function to be performed?

Mr. PEPPER. The War Manpower Commission, I will say to the able Senator. I read from the bottom of page 3:

(3) for purposes of making an individual finding as to occupational deferment, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is empowered, subject to direction by the President, to employ the officers or employees of the War Manpower Commission or of any other Federal agency and to establish such additional organization and procedure as he shall deem necessary and proper.

I will say to the Senator that the Chairman of the Commission would have power to set up additional personnel, but it will be noted that emphasis is also upon his using the existing Federal personnel for that purpose.

Mr. FERGUSON. How many employees does the Senator anticipate that would take? Would it take the same number as are now employed on the local boards?

Mr. PEPPER. It would depend on the way the War Manpower Director organized the program. My opinion is that he would accomplish the result essentially by the personnel he already has in his Employment Service, his War Manpower Commission Service, the agricultural activities which are now in existence, the industry committees of the War Labor Board, and that sort of thing.

Mr. FERGUSON. Would these men be on the public pay roll or would they be volunteer employees such as now constitute the draft boards?

Mr. PEPPER. The Director would have authority, in my opinion, to delegate this power or use as instrumentalities volunteer personnel. He would have authority to employ personnel within the scope of his appropriation, although, of course, this measure does not carry any appropriation.

Mr. FERGUSON. How long does the Senator anticipate it will take to set up these boards? Does he think it would do any good to the farmers this spring?

Mr. PEPPER. I think it would function immediately, because the Department of Agriculture already has an organization in every county, and the Director is authorized to delegate this duty of his to other Federal agencies. Of course, since he has already delegated to the Secretary of Agriculture the question of manpower for agriculture, I assume he would immediately do that in this case; he should do it, so that the Food Administrator's representatives in a given area would be the ones who would primarily take the responsibility of achieving occupational deferment. So the plan is subject to immediate utilization.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Overton
Austin	Gurney	Pepper
Bailey	Hatch	Radcliffe
Ball	Hawkes	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hill	Reynolds
Bone	Holman	Robertson
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Scruggs
Bridges	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Brooks	Kilgore	Smith
Buck	La Follette	Taft
Burton	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capper	McCarran	Tobey
Caraway	McClellan	Tunnell
Chavez	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Downey	Murdoch	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, just preliminary to a vote on the pending proposed substitute for the Bankhead amendment as modified, and for the benefit of those Senators who were not on the floor when the modification of the amendment now about to be voted on occurred, I wish to say that all that is now left in the amendment before the Senate is, first, provision for the establishment of a Committee of Requirement and Program, to be established by the Congress, to consist of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Food Administrator, and the Director of Economic Stabilization, whose duty it shall be to determine the over-all manpower situation in the country, and to make an allocation of manpower resources among the several essential national programs. That is the first provision.

The second provision, which is section 3, provides that the power of occupational deferment is vested in the War Manpower Commission, subject to review by the President. In that way there may be deferment of essential workers in agriculture and industry by the requirement of the War Manpower Commission, which, for the first time, would have that statutory power. Their actions would be subject to review by the President, so that they may be kept in conformity with the national interest and a national program.

Mr. President, this is offered as a substitute for the amendment offered by the able Senator from Alabama, which we venture to believe, proposes only blanket deferment of agricultural labor. Our proposal goes further than that, and provides an affirmative approach to the problem, and at the same time gives the power to achieve deferment of essential workers, which is the principal aim and objective of the amendment of the able Senator from Alabama.



I wish to ask for a roll call at the appropriate time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I shall vote for the committee substitute for the pending measure and for the final passage of the bill with great reluctance and regret, but vote for it I shall. I say I shall vote for it with reluctance because I recognize the innate difficulties of legislating upon such a matter as this comprehensively, and yet in sufficient detail adequately to cover the subject.

I recognize full well, as everyone else must, that this is a matter which should have been handled by administration rather than by legislation. It is a matter which can properly and adequately be handled by administration, and can only be handled by legislation in the broadest way, and with the greatest difficulty.

I say that I shall vote for the bill with regret, and my regret lies in the fact that, because there has been such a complete and tragic break-down of administration, such a display of absolute incompetence in administration, this broad general legislation, this blanket deferment, as it has been called, has been made necessary.

Mr. President, I stated a few days ago, during an interruption I made of the very able speech of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], that I feared the passage of the pending bill at this late day was a good deal akin to the proposition of locking the barn door after the horse had been stolen. I have received scores of letters, indeed hundreds, from farmers in my State, telling me that it is really too late to save the farm-labor situation, because of the fact that under the bullheaded policy of interfering with agricultural production heretofore adopted and carried out, most of the effective farm labor, most of the young farm labor, so necessary to operate the farms, has already been drafted and is in the armed forces. Nevertheless, I believe that even now some measure such as can be taken by legislation should be taken in order, so far as possible, to save the agricultural situation in the United States.

It is my belief that the production of food with which to feed the armed forces of the United States, from Iceland to Guadalcanal, from India to England, from north Africa to Ireland, indeed, all over the world, is about as essential as having men in the armed forces to eat the food and fire the guns.

I charge, without fear of successful contradiction, that, except for incompetence in administration, the situation which has now developed of a shortage in food production in the United States would have been recognized a year and a half or 2 years ago, and should never have been permitted to come about. Now it is a question of what can be done to remedy the situation so far as possible.

Let me say that, in my opinion, the adoption by the Congress last fall—in itself a belated measure—of the Tydings amendment, has done a great deal toward the amelioration of the food situation in

the United States, but under the present selective-service system that amendment has not been entirely effective. Each local draft board has been permitted to pursue its own policy, to do as it pleased, with regard to the enforcement and the carrying out of the policy enunciated in the Tydings amendment. I know that in my own home county, St. Louis County, of which St. Louis City is not a part, the population of which is made up largely of truck farmers, who to a large extent feed the city of St. Louis, there are several draft boards. Most of them have carried into effect the purpose and intention of the Tydings amendment. However, I have had complaints from a multitude of citizens of St. Louis County that one draft board has, for reasons of its own, seen fit to disregard the general policy established by the Tydings amendment, and the directives issued thereunder, and it has been impossible to secure any adequate action from the State authorities, or from the Federal authorities in Washington, on the theory that each draft board is independent, and can do as it pleases. That has been true of other boards in my State, and in other sections of the United States.

Let me read a letter which I received a few days ago from a fine, competent young farmer, in order to illustrate the disregard of the spirit of the Tydings amendment and, as a matter of fact, of the letter of the Tydings amendment, on the part of a local draft board on its own motion. This writer says:

I was born and raised on a farm, and now have one of my own. I never did anything else. I have worked hard from sunup to sundown, and have done chores after that. I have made a crop every year—corn, wheat, rye, oats, hay crops, and potatoes—according to the Government farm program. My draft board will not defer me because I do not live on the place, on which there are no buildings. My stock and 154 acres will bring nothing if I am drafted now at this season. What can be done about the situation?

Mr. President, here is the case of a man who never did anything in his life except to work on a farm, who has been a farmer from his boyhood, who finally saved enough money to make a payment on a farm, and who has been running that farm and working on it from sunup to sundown, and therefore, is operating in accordance with the Government farm program; but he cannot erect buildings on his farm which he actually owns and works, and unless he erects a building there or sets up a tent and bivouacs there he is denied a permit.

Mr. President, I cite that case out of a great many which have come to my attention to show that in many instances the local draft boards have completely disregarded the whole spirit and, I believe, the letter of the Tydings amendment.

I said a moment ago, and I repeat, that any prudent management of these vast affairs would have recognized long since that, by the double process of drafting farm labor and of refusing the farmer agricultural implements to take the place of farm labor, a shortage of production was bound to be created. Yet the pow-

ers that be simply believed that by writing down an allotment and a quota on a piece of paper, and making it public, they could bring food products and other farm commodities into production. Of course, anyone who had any sense knew that that could not be done. So I say that, in my opinion, legislation has become a necessity because of the break-down in administrative agencies.

I should say in this connection, Mr. President, that it has been called to my attention today by Colonel Keesling, of the Selective Service System, that a new order has been issued as to appeals in occupational cases which may bring some improvement in the situation I have just described. I cannot understand why such an order, which the Selective Service had the authority to issue, has not been issued long ago, but I should say that the improvement it will bring about is problematical.

Mr. President, I now come to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER]. The Senator from Florida has, as I understand, stricken out of it sections 1, 4, 5, 6, and 7. I may say that, in my opinion, if he would strike out sections 2 and 3 he would very much improve the amendment.

What do sections 2 and 3 provide? Do they correct the situation concerning which the whole country has been complaining? They do not. Do they prescribe any rules for the improvement of that situation? They do not. Do they make for the improvement in administration by discharging the incompetents who have brought about the present tragic condition? They do not. They simply would create a new super-agency, imposed on top of the very agencies which have brought about this situation, and create a few more jobs. They would create a committee on requirements and program—referred to in this act as the committee—which, of course, will have to have an organization of its own, a headquarters of its own, and numerous personnel of its own. That committee would be created under the chairmanship of a director of war mobilization—

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am going to ask that the two and one-half lines providing for the chairmanship of the director of war mobilization to be appointed by the President, may be deleted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator repeat the proposed modification of his amendment?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall strike out the following language, beginning in line 5, on page 1:

Under the chairmanship of a Director of War Mobilization to be appointed by the President (referred to in this act as the Director) and—

So there will be no new organization.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I freely admit that anything deleted from this amendment is an improvement, and if the Senator will continue to whittle down his amendment he may whittle it down to a point where it

might not be so objectionable. But with that language deleted let us see what the amendment does. It provides:

There is hereby created a Committee on Requirements and Program (referred to in this act as the "Committee") consisting of the Secretaries of War and Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Food Administrator, and the Director of Economic Stabilization.

Mr. President, who are those men? Who are the functionaries who are to make up this super committee? With the exception of the Stabilization Director, they are the very oligarchists who got us into this tragic situation. They are the men who are absolutely responsible for the confusion and the break-down in administration which makes the proposed legislation necessary.

I am reminded of the story which I heard when I was a boy, about the old fellow who was haled into court for stealing chickens. When his case was called the judge looked down over his "specs" and said, "Are you the defendant in this case?" The old man said, "No, sir; no, sir; nothing like that. I'm just the man that stole the chickens." [Laughter.] And so it is in this case. This new super-administrative agency is to be composed of the very men whose confusion and incompetency have brought about the present situation.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to call the Senator's attention, in view of what he has stated, to lines 3, 4, 5, and 6 on page 2 of the amendment.

This committee—

The committee which the Senator has described—

shall establish, subject to review and modification by the President, a national program for maximum mobilization of manpower for the military forces and for military—

Please note—

and essential civilian production.

I ask the Senator from Missouri what that means to him, and if it does not mean control of almost every civilian activity in the country?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It not only means the control of every civilian activity in the country, but it means the control of every military activity in the country.

Mr. WALSH. And also economic activities.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And also economic activities. It means the control of munitions production; it means—

Mr. WALSH. Does it mean that the committee could close up one industry and open up another?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It seems so to me under the provisions of the amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not very clear to the able Senator from Missouri that "a

Committee on Requirements and Programs," which is to define the needs of the various activities of the Nation essential to the prosecution of the war—

shall establish, subject to review and modification by the President, a national program for maximum mobilization of manpower for the military forces and for military and essential civilian production—

And that this program, as defined in line 7 and the following lines—

shall take the form of a detailed schedule of military and essential civilian production and specific quotas of manpower to be made available.

In other words, it shall determine the manpower needs of the various essential activities of the Nation, military and civilian.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I understood from the explanation of the amendment given by the Senator from Florida that that was his intention. I believe the language beginning on line 7, page 2, referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], is readily susceptible to the construction placed upon it by him.

Mr. President, what would this amendment do? After organizing into another committee the various administrative agencies who are responsible for the present confusion—for the present debacle—it would simply give them authority to do what the President already has authority to do under the law.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] read the law a little while ago. I shall read it again because I think it is very important to understand what this so-called palliative of the Senator from Florida would actually do. Subparagraph (e) of section 5 of the present law—the Selective Service Act—is as follows:

(e) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of those men whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose activity in other endeavors, is found in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest.

If any language could be broader than that I am unable to conceive of it.

I read further:

The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States (1) of those men in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of those men found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. No deferment from such training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual, and no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups or of groups of individuals in any plant or institution.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it the point of the able Senator from Missouri that my

amendment is of no avail or not necessary, because the President already possesses the power to do what my amendment provides?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. My point is that the President already possesses the power to do everything that the amendment of the Senator from Florida would give him authority to do, and if the President has not exercised the power he now has, and the officials appointed under his Executive order have not exercised that power or discretion, then the only thing the Congress can do is not to refer it back to the same officials who have heretofore failed to exercise that power, but by legislation to prescribe as accurately as may be the policies the Congress desires to have carried out.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Does not the President already have the power to do everything the Bankhead amendment proposes to do?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes, Mr. President. That is precisely what creates the necessity for the Bankhead amendment. The President has the power, but the President has not exercised it. The purpose of the amendment is to say that the Congress wants that done; to put it into legislative form, and make it the duty of the responsible public officials to carry out the announced policy of the Congress. That is the exact purpose and the policy of the Bankhead amendment. If that is not so, I ask the Senator from Alabama to correct me.

Mr. PEPPER. The power to defer for occupational reasons is not vested in the form of board to which the able Senator has referred, but in the chairman of the War Manpower Commission under section 3 of my amendment. The Senator will agree, will he not, that the War Manpower Commissioner does not possess that power.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not understand that he has been specifically given that power by the President. He could have been given it at any time.

Mr. PEPPER. If he were given that power, the authority for occupational deferment would exist by Congressional action.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The question would be left to the discretion of the administrative officials, who have failed to exercise any discretions which they may have had. The purpose of the Bankhead amendment is to provide in specific legislative terms for meeting the pressing and vital need for the production of food supplies.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it not fair to say that an alternative is provided as between the Bankhead amendment and the amendment now pending, namely if we wish to make a blanket deferment for everybody in agricultural occupations, it may be achieved by the Bankhead amendment, and if it is desired to give statutory authority to the War Manpower Commission to make occupational deferments for agriculture and industry, it may be done through my amendment?



Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Congress has tried to handle that problem by giving discretion to the Executive. The discretion has not been exercised. The hour in the agricultural situation is now 11 o'clock and 59 minutes. If Congress is to do anything to save the situation, in my opinion it cannot do anything by further beating around the stump and leaving it to someone's discretion. It means postponement, and postponement means failure and futility. If Congress is to do anything, the sooner it does it, the better for all concerned.

Mr. PEPPER. Under the existing administrative set-up does the Food Administrator have the power to require occupational deferment of essential farm workers?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not understand that he can require it; and I do not understand that he would be able to do so under the amendment of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. In the pending amendment, beginning near the bottom of page 3 is the following language:

(2) for purposes of making an individual finding as to occupational deferment, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is empowered, subject to direction by the President, to employ the officers or employees of the War Manpower Commission or of any other Federal agency.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That merely provides for an additional number of jobs, Mr. President. It does not help out the farm situation.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will allow me to complete my statement, under that language the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission could designate another Federal agency to exercise the power of occupational deferment. If he should delegate the subject of agricultural manpower to the Food Administrator would it not be reasonable to presume that he would also delegate the power of occupational deferment to the Food Administrator? If he should do so, would it not be fair to presume that the Food Administrator would actually require the deferment of essential agricultural labor, taking into consideration the circumstances of each individual case?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I dare say that every Senator—certainly every Senator from an agricultural State—has had the experience of trying to handle this problem with the administrative agencies. If he calls up one agency he is told that another agency has it in charge. If he calls up the other agency he is told that there will be a joint committee representing all agencies, and that possibly at some time he will receive some relief through that committee. No relief has been afforded, and the situation has grown steadily worse while the administrators have conferred with each other. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick." While that has been taking place the production of food in the United States has been steadily falling until it has reached the absolute danger point, not only as it relates to the requirements of the civilian population of the United

States, but also the requirements of our armed forces abroad, to say nothing of our obligations to our allies. While I deeply explore the necessity for legislation on the subject at this time, if anything is to be done it can be done only by legislation.

It is said that this is class legislation; and, of course, it is. Any blanket deferment is class legislation. However, it is class legislation not in the interest of the farmers as a class. It is deferment in the interest of a vital necessity of all the people of the United States as well as our allies, to whom we are under obligation to furnish food. This bill should have been passed a long time ago, when the necessity for it developed. Any delay, such as recommitting the bill to the Committee on Military Affairs, as the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] states he intends to propose, would be a source of very material danger to the well-being of the United States and to the winning of the war.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I intend to support the pending measure, which is known as the Bankhead bill, as proposed to be amended by the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON]. I sincerely hope the bill will not be amended in such fashion that bureau or agency regulations will be written afterward to destroy its purpose, namely, to keep necessary farm labor on the farm.

The farm problem finally has become recognized, though somewhat belatedly, as a food problem. This means that every one of more than 130,000,000 persons in the United States—plus no one knows how many millions in other lands—has a vital interest in its solution.

When this was merely a farm problem instead of a food problem, only those residing on farms or in close touch with the people living on the 6,000,000 farms in the United States took an active interest in proposed solutions of the problem.

But now, and for the next few years, during the war and for several years following, every one of us will be deeply and feelingly interested in the food problem. Already the pinch is being felt.

Food may become so scarce that rationing of nearly all foods, except possibly bread, is more than likely to become a reality before the end of the present year. I dislike to think what will happen if we have a poor crop year either in 1943 or in 1944.

But, of course, rationing is only the answer to the problem of distributing food.

Rationing will not grow one kernel of wheat or produce one drop of milk or increase by one ounce the amount of beef, pork, lamb, or other meats available. Rationing will not lay one egg, or grow one small potato.

The real answer to the food problem is production of foodstuffs on the 6,000,000-or-so farms in the United States.

To produce food the farmer must have labor; he must have manpower. That labor will produce best if it is skilled, experienced labor. Women and children

from the cities can help to some extent in the harvest; but if we depend too much on that source we will fall down on the job of food production.

The farmer must have machinery and equipment. The W. P. B. ought to be looking forward to increasing the amount of farm machinery manufactured, instead of trying to hold it down to one-fourth of 1940 production. A step has been made. I have been informed recently that production is to be allowed to the extent of one-half the 1940 production.

Many farms must have fertilizers. Livestock and poultry require protein feeds. These must be produced by labor. Oil-bearing crops require labor to produce; and whether we like it or not—though this is not directly involved in the pending legislation—farmers must have good prices to assure continued production at high levels.

The United States is engaged in an all-out, global war.

But we are committed to financing that war to the extent that United States dollar expenditures for war purposes this year will amount to more than the expenditures of all our allies and all our enemies combined. That is hard to believe; but the cold, hard statistics tell us it is a fact.

We are not only financing a large portion of the world in this global war but are also fighting all over the world, and undertaking to feed many millions of people throughout the world, in addition to more than 130,000,000 of our own people.

Latest estimates from the Department of Agriculture on feeding other peoples, which we have undertaken, give some idea of the amount of food which will go out of the country this year.

More than one-half—the estimate is from 50 to 60 percent—of all canned fruit in the United States is to be sent abroad this year, for military and lend-lease purposes. Also almost one-half of all canned vegetables are needed overseas for Allied armed forces and starving civilian populations.

One-fourth of the beef produced this year is to go abroad; 35 to 40 percent of all pork, not including lard; between one-fourth and one-third of the eggs laid in the United States are destined for foreign consumption this year; also one-fifth of the butter, 40 to 45 percent of the cheese, 40 to 50 percent of the condensed and evaporated milk, 25 to 30 percent of the lard, and nearly one-fourth of the other edible fats and oils.

From 35 to 40 percent of dried fruits are reserved for export for military and lend-lease purposes; from 10 to 15 percent of wheat; from 15 to 20 percent of rice. The other day 60,000 tons of foodstuffs were unloaded from one convoy to north Africa.

No wonder we now are threatened with food shortages in many lines. We are warned that all of us must tighten our belts and that before the end of the year it will be patriotic to wear a lean and hungry look.

But despite all this it is not necessary to become unduly alarmed. Huge as are the demands for food, there is no reason for any one starving or facing even near-starvation in the United States if—and I wish to emphasize this point—the farmers of the United States are allowed sufficient labor, sufficient farm machinery and equipment, and, for many farms, fertilizers. Livestock producers must have the necessary protein feeds to enable them to do the job.

Crops must be planted; they must be cultivated in most instances; they must be harvested. Dairy cows have to be fed, cared for, and milked regularly. Eggs and poultry do not just happen; beef and pork come from cattle and hogs, and these must be bred, fed, and cared for intelligently and constantly, then slaughtered and processed before they become food.

I realize that women and children can to some extent replace men on farms. They already have done so, by the thousands and tens of thousands. But in order to feed all our people, and so many billion others to boot, the farms of America apparently need approximately 3,000,000 more workers.

If these men can be obtained without taking any from the armed forces, well and good. I would not keep one needed man out of military service when this Nation is at war. But if food can win the war and help write the peace, the lack of it can certainly prolong the war, and militate greatly against writing the peace. I urge the adoption of the Johnson amendment.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Missouri yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not have the floor, Mr. President. If I had, I should be glad to yield.

Mr. WILEY. Let me say that as I understood the Senator's position, it was in agreement with the position at which I have arrived: First, that under the Selective Service Act adequate power was lodged in the executive branch of the Government to handle the whole manpower situation, but it simply fell down on the job, and the mess that we are in has come about simply because of a failure to do what should have been done.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is correct, and that is the only justification for the passage of legislation on the subject, which I admit must necessarily be imperfect and cumbersome.

Mr. WILEY. Very well. We find that the executive branch of the Government has the power, but has not exercised it; we find that the executive branch of the Government has acknowledged that it has not exercised the power. So we pass a law, after 70 percent of the farm help that has left the farms has gone into industry, and 30 percent has gone into the armed forces. Now, when only 250,000 young men are left on the farms, we propose to pass a law saying, "Freeze those young men there." In other words, we give the impression—and that is the danger—that the proposed legislation is a remedy, whereas I understand that the figures show that we have taken off the farms about 1,200,000 men who should have remained there in order to enable

us to obtain the maximum possible production.

The question I wish to ask is whether the Senator thinks that the passage either of the Bankhead law or the adoption of the Bankhead amendment or the Johnson amendment would do the job.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, that is the only thing that can be done at this time. I certainly do not think it will restore production to what might have been possible if a more comprehensive policy had been adopted at the time of the inception of the matter; but it seems to me that under the circumstances it is the only thing which can be done.

Let me say that I do not agree with the Senator's figure that there are only 250,000 young men left on the farms. I do not know where the Senator got that figure.

Mr. BANKHEAD rose.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. General Patterson wrote that they would defer 3,000,000 farm workers. I am astonished at the figure the Senator from Wisconsin has given. Why do they object to the passage of the bill if they are going to defer all the farmers, anyway?

Mr. WILEY. I must say that when I listened to the debate several days ago I heard the statement made that there were left on the farms of America only 250,000 single men.

However, let me come to my next question, because I am vitally interested—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, permit me to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the bill is not limited to single men. It is true that very few single men yet to be called under the draft are left on the farms. Very few single men are left. The bill covers all men—those from 18 to 38 years of age—wherever they may be.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield very briefly to me on that point, and then proceed to the next point, if he desires to ask the Senator from Missouri another question?

Mr. WILEY. Yes; I am very happy to yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I have received a telegram sent yesterday, March 16, from a small agricultural county in Colorado. On the 6th day of March, as the Senator will recall, a directive was issued by General Hershey with respect to manpower on the farms—a directive which, by the way, should have been issued immediately upon the passage of the Tydings Act, back on the 13th of November, but it was not issued until the 6th of March. However, 10 days after it was issued we find that this is what happened in this small county in Colorado—the telegram is addressed to me, and comes from Delta, Colo.:

Despite all possible efforts of our county United States Department of Agriculture war boards—

That refers to the county war boards that are set up throughout the country—fifty-eight men left today for military service, 22 of whom were farm workers, some of them essential, and who will need immediate replacement. Of what use is the experience

of the county United States Department of Agriculture war boards if it is not to be used in cases such as these? Some of these men are needed back in this county or our food production goals will suffer. Details of individual cases are available if you wish.

The telegram is signed by Mr. A. F. Hoffman, Jr., secretary of the Delta County U. S. D. A. War Board.

We have heard during the debate that the selective service boards were to be governed by the county war boards in determining whether men were essential on the farms; and yet, 10 days after we were given that assurance, we have evidence that the advice of the county war boards has been completely ignored, and that the selective service boards have paid no attention whatsoever to it.

Of course, the Senator's point is well taken—that we are locking the door after the horse has been stolen. There is no doubt about that—that is, most of the horses have been stolen; there are 300,000 colts left there. Why not keep them?

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I do not agree with the position of any of the Senators who have spoken in that connection. The point I am trying to make is that we have focused the attention of the country and of this body on the retention on the farms of 250,000 single men, when what we should do is focus attention on the problem of how to get more labor, together with adequate machinery, back on the farms. It seems to me that is the proper legislative function.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator again why he confines his argument to single men.

Mr. WILEY. I do not confine my argument to them.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the argument the Senator has been making.

Mr. WILEY. No; I have stated the position as we see it and as I heard it related in the Senate, that, practically, under the enlightenment the boards have received, they are not taking off the farms any men except the single men. Am I mistaken about that?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Evidently the Senator is, judging from the telegram which the Senator from Colorado has read.

Mr. WILEY. Oh, no; the telegram does not say that they are taking married men.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; there is no distinction as between single men and married men.

Mr. WILEY. Did the telegram say so? Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; it did not say anything on that point.

Mr. WILEY. No; it did not. I heard the Senator read it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator does not doubt that a great many married men who were on the farms have been drafted; does he?

Mr. WILEY. I agree that they have been drafted. The barn door has been closed after the horses have gone; but I want to get a few more horses back on the farms if I may be pardoned the allusion; and that seems to me to be the way to start solving the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, as modified, proposed by the Sen-



ator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] to the committee substitute.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hatch	Radcliffe
Austin	Hawkes	Reed
Bailey	Hayden	Revercomb
Ball	Hill	Reynolds
Bankhead	Holman	Robertson
Billbo	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Bridges	Kilgore	Smith
Brooks	La Follette	Taft
Buck	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	Lodge	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	McCarran	Tobey
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Caraway	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Moore	Wherry
Downey	Murdock	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Willis
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson
Gillette	Overton	
Gurney	Pepper	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to the amendment in the nature of a substitute of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] for the committee substitute. On that question the yeas and nays have been demanded. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, a few days ago I telegraphed the commissioners of agriculture in each of the 48 States and asked them what was their idea or what were the facts as to the prospects of production in 1943 as compared with 1942. I have about 30 replies. They are short, and I ask that they be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the telegrams will be printed in the RECORD.

The telegrams are as follows:

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, March 15, 1943.  
 Senator E. D. SMITH,  
*Senate Committee on Agriculture,*  
*Senate Office Building,*  
*Washington, D. C.:*  
 Estimate State average, all crops and livestock, down 5 to 15 percent.  
 TRACY R. WELLING,  
*Commissioner of Agriculture,*  
*State of Utah.*

SACRAMENTO, CALIF., March 16, 1943.  
 Senator E. D. SMITH,  
*Chairman, Committee on*  
*Agriculture, Senate Office*  
*Building, Washington, D. C.:*  
 Reurtel, 15th, I estimate California 1943 production crops and livestock by volume

will not exceed 85 percent 1942 figure. Regards.

W. J. CECIL,  
*California Director of Agriculture.*

DOVER, DEL., March 16, 1943.  
 Hon. E. D. SMITH,  
*Committee on Agriculture,*  
*Senate Office Building:*  
 Estimate 10 to 15 percent reduction over all overage in 1943 crops compared with 1942 providing weather conditions favorable.  
 RALPH C. WILSON,  
*Secretary, State Board of Agriculture.*

TOPEKA, KANS., March 16, 1943.  
 Senator E. D. SMITH,  
*Senate Committee on Agriculture:*  
 Kansas food production this year estimate 10 percent less.

J. C. MOHLER,  
*Secretary.*

COLUMBIA, S. C., March 16, 1943.  
 Hon. E. D. SMITH,  
*Senate Office Building:*  
 Assuming normal weather general opinion here is 1943 crop production will be approximately 15 percent less than 1942.  
 J. ROY JONES,  
*Commissioner of Agriculture.*

SPRINGFIELD, ILL., March 16, 1943.  
 Hon. E. D. SMITH,  
*United States Senator:*  
 Federal and State statistician estimates that under average conditions production of food crops expected to be 2 percent less than 1942. Estimate beef and milk production about same as 1942. Poultry, eggs, and pork estimated 10 to 20 percent increase.  
 RAY A. DILLINGER,  
*Assistant Director,*  
*Illinois Department of Agriculture.*

RICHMOND, VA., March 16, 1943.  
 Hon. E. D. SMITH,  
*Senate Committee on Agriculture:*  
 Answering your wire will advise that I have previously estimated 15-percent decrease compared with 1942. Complete report will be out March 20.  
 L. M. WALKER, JR.,  
*Commissioner of Agriculture*  
*and Immigration.*

CHARLESTON, W. VA., March 17, 1943.  
 Senator E. D. SMITH,  
*Chairman, Senate Committee*  
*on Agriculture, Washington, D. C.:*  
 Your wire from best information farm production will be from 20 to 25 percent less than 1942. Goal sign-up of farmers shows about 15 percent less. Victory gardens will be substantially increased over 1942. Farm labor conditions bad and getting worse. Office of Price Administration regulations discourage farmers who could increase production and sell at home. Regards.

J. B. McLAUGHLIN,  
*Commissioner of Agriculture.*

HARTFORD, CONN., March 16, 1943.  
 Senator E. D. SMITH,  
*Senate Committee on Agriculture:*  
 Preliminary intention figures for half the counties indicate slight increase in dairy cows with substantial increase in potatoes and poultry. Expect final War Board figures shortly.

OLCOTT F. KING,  
*Commissioner of Agriculture.*

SIoux FALLS, S. DAK., March 16, 1943.  
 Senator E. D. SMITH:  
 Your request to South Dakota Department of Agriculture relative production food crops 1943 compared with 1942 was referred to this

office. Production in 1943 depends entirely on acreages seeded and yields per acre. Sorry to advise law prohibits our releasing information relative 1943 intended acreage before official release by Crop Reporting Board of United States Department of Agriculture which will be at 3 p. m. March 19. This early in the season average yields applied to intended 1943 planted acreages is best indication of 1943 production. All such information may be obtained from the Crop Reporting Board which is the source of all official estimates. For your further information practically all armchair snap judgments and hurried surveys by persons and agencies who are inexperienced in crop and livestock forecasting and estimating are grossly in error.

EVAN V. JONES,  
*Agricultural Statistician for South Dakota.*

BOISE, IDAHO, March 17, 1943.  
 Senator E. D. SMITH,  
*Senate Office Building,*  
*Washington, D. C.:*

Believe impossible under existing conditions to produce over 80 percent of last year's food production. Farmers very discouraged, only encouragement is good work farm bloc is doing. Keep up the good work. Believe Government restrictions having most hampering effect on production. Farmers will do best possible if given a chance.

HARVEY SCHWENDIMAN,  
*Commissioner of Agriculture.*

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA., March 16, 1943.  
 Senator E. D. SMITH,  
*Senate Committee on Agriculture:*  
 Estimated percentage production food crops in Oklahoma 1943 as follows: Wheat 10 percent less, corn 8 percent less, oats 12 percent more, barley 15 percent more, rye 10 percent more, peanuts 100 percent more, soybeans 75 percent more, cowpeas 5 percent more, sweetpotatoes 15 percent more, potatoes 35 percent more, peaches 20 percent less, and pears 10 percent less.

JOE C. SCOTT,  
*President, State Board of Agriculture.*

RENO, NEV., March 16, 1943.  
 Hon. E. D. SMITH,  
*Senate Office Building:*  
 No accurate information on Nevada crop production for 1943 as compared with 1942 available yet. Opinions obtained from various sources estimate livestock production will be about same with possibly reduction in sheep. Dairy production will be considerably lower with field crops requiring much labor, as much as 25 percent lower. Assurance that labor be made available at early date essential.

GEO. G. SCHWEIS,  
*Director.*

TALLAHASSEE, FLA., March 16, 1943.  
 Hon. E. D. SMITH,  
*United States Senate,*  
*Senate Committee on Agriculture:*  
 Present prospects are that the decrease will be about 15 percent. Suggest that you wire H. A. Marks, Federal statistician, Orlando, for further information.

NATHAN MAYO,  
*Commissioner of Agriculture.*

PROVIDENCE, R. I., March 16, 1943.  
 Senator E. D. SMITH,  
*Senate Committee on Agriculture:*  
 Increase 10 percent in poultry possible, decrease in vegetables, which will be offset by victory garden production. Anticipate decrease in milk. There was an increase in 1942 over 1941. Picture not as bad as scare-mongers make it. Labor situation serious. Could upset entire farm program.  
 R. G. BRESSLER,  
*Director of Agriculture.*

MADISON, WIS., March 16, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH:

Expected food crop acreage in Wisconsin this year is between 1 and 2 percent higher than last year.

W. H. EBLING,  
Statistician, State Department of  
Agriculture.

OLYMPIA, WASH., March 16, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH:

Doubtful if food production for State of Washington will exceed 90 percent of 1942.

ARTHUR E. COX,  
Director of Agriculture.

JACKSON, MISS., March 16, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH:

Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,  
Senate Building:

Retel. U. S. D. A. War Board farm survey indicates food crop production in 1943 from 95 to 135 percent of 1942 production. Same survey indicates 15 percent reduction farm labor in 1943 below 1942.

S. I. CORLEY,  
Commissioner of Agriculture.

AUSTIN, TEX., March 16, 1943.

ELLISON D. SMITH, Chairman:

Texas food crops will be 15 percent less in 1943 than produced in 1942. Seventy-five percent Texas farm area too dry to germinate seed.

J. E. McDONALD,  
Commissioner of Agriculture,  
State of Texas.

LITTLE ROCK, ARK., March 16, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,

Senate Committee on Agriculture:

Due to unsettled policy regarding farm labor and farm machinery, fertilizer, and prices, impossible to estimate at present percentage decrease in food crops 1943 compared with 1942.

Mrs. LEE WHITE WALTERS,  
Secretary, Arkansas Agricultural  
Industrial Commission.

HELENA, MONT., March 16, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,

Senate Committee on Agriculture,  
Senate Office Building:

According to present indications to plant reports, production food crops the same for 1943 as for 1942, provided growing conditions the same.

ALBERT H. KROUSE,  
Commissioner, Agriculture,  
Labor, and Industry.

AUGUSTA, MAINE, March 16, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,

Senate Committee on Agriculture:

Re telegram, food production Maine farms 1943 estimated 90 percent of 1942.

CARL R. SMITH,  
Commissioner,  
Maine Department of Agriculture.

BOSTON, MASS., March 17, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,

Senate Committee on Agriculture:

Re farm production 1943, we expect milk will be down 10 percent, vegetables same acreage as 1942, eggs probably increase 5 or 10 percent, fruit definitely down substantially.

LOUIS A. WEBSTER,  
Acting Commissioner.

ATLANTA, GA., March 15, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,

Senate Committee on Agriculture,  
Washington, D. C.:

Present prospect crops in Georgia 25 percent reduction in acreage. Shortage of labor, fertilizer, and equipment would make pros-

pect for additional shortage. Weather conditions of course unknown but can hardly expect better weather than 1942. My opinion is prospect for 1943 crop to show reduction between 25 and 50 percent from 1942 production.

TOM LINDER,  
Commissioner of Agriculture.

SALEM, OREG., March 15, 1943.

Senator E. D. SMITH,

Senate Committee on Agriculture,  
Washington, D. C.:

Your telegram of today referred to Robert Taylor Corvallis, Oregon chairman of war board, who has this matter in hand.

J. D. MICKLE,  
Director, Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement concerning the vote I am about to cast. I had intended to support the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], but the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] has seen fit to modify his amendment and to eliminate from it the only sections which held out any hope of increasing the manpower on the farms. That portion of the amendment having been eliminated, much as I favor bringing some order out of the chaos in the administration of manpower, I cannot accept the residue of the amendment as a substitute for the Bankhead bill, which, at least, will prevent any further military drain upon the farms of the country.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. DANAHER. As the pending substitute may now be stated, it includes sections 1, 2, and 3 of the amendment which the Senator from Florida has offered and had printed and lie on the table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. With certain modifications, that is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. May the modifications be stated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The modifications will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 18, after the word "finding", insert "subject to review by the President", and on page 1, strike out, in lines 5, 6, and 7, the words "under the chairmanship of a Director of War Mobilization to be appointed by the President (referred to in this act as the 'Director')."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that a number of Senators have come to the floor, and, as it is rather brief, I ask that the amendment, as modified, be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read, as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

This act may be cited as the Manpower Mobilization Act.

SEC. 2. There is hereby created a Committee on Requirements and Program (referred to in this act as the "Committee") consisting of the Secretaries of War and Navy, the Chief of Staff of the Army, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, the Chairman of the War Production Board, the Food Administrator, and the Director of Economic Stabilization. This committee shall establish, subject to review and modification by the President, a national

program for maximum mobilization of manpower for the military forces and for military and essential civilian production (referred to in this act as the "program"). The program shall take the form of a detailed schedule of military and essential civilian production and specific quotas of manpower to be made available to the military forces and to particular categories of military and civilian production. In preparing the program the committee shall take into account schedules of military and essential civilian production furnished by the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Food Administrator, according to appropriate jurisdiction, statements of manpower requirements for the military forces furnished by the War and Navy Departments, and statements of manpower requirements for military and essential civilian production furnished by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission and determined by him in cooperation with the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Food Administrator. The quotas of manpower to be made available to the military forces as determined under the program shall supersede present quotas employed under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. The schedules of military and essential civilian production and the manpower quotas relating thereto determined under the program shall be binding upon the War Production Board, the Food Administration, the War Manpower Commission, the Office of Economic Stabilization, and other war agencies in their determination and operations relating to production and manpower.

SEC. 3. The Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Any provision of this act to the contrary notwithstanding—

"(1) whenever the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission deems it necessary in order to meet the program determined in accordance with section 2 of the Manpower Mobilization Act that occupational deferments be granted to persons engaged in military or essential civilian production or in essential activity related thereto, he shall make a finding, subject to review by the President, to this effect and such findings shall be conclusive upon all civilian local boards and any other civilian agencies functioning under this act. No other occupational deferments shall be granted under this act except upon such a finding by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission;

"(2) for purposes of making an individual finding as to occupational deferment, the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission is empowered, subject to direction by the President, to employ the officers or employees of the War Manpower Commission or of any other Federal agency and to establish such additional organization and procedure as he shall deem necessary and proper."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment as modified, offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to the amendment offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] as a substitute for the committee substitute. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. It is my understanding that if present he would vote as I shall vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior



Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I am not advised how he would vote. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who, if present, would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], who is absent on business of the Senate. I do not know how he would vote if present. I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and vote "nay." I am advised that the Senator from New Jersey would vote "nay," if present.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are out of the city on official business for the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are out of the city on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] have been called to Government Departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and Mr. STEWART would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 9, nays 66, as follows:

## YEAS—9

Austin	Murdock	Thomas, Utah
Danaher	O'Mahoney	Tunnell
Kilgore	Pepper	Vandenberg

## NAYS—66

Aiken	Connally	Lucas
Bailey	Davis	McCarran
Ball	Ellender	McClellan
Bankhead	Ferguson	McFarland
Bilbo	George	McNary
Bone	Gillette	Maloney
Brewster	Gurney	Maybank
Bridges	Hatch	Millikin
Brooks	Hawkes	Moore
Buck	Hayden	Nye
Burton	Hill	O'Daniel
Bushfield	Holman	Overton
Byrd	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Caraway	La Follette	Revercomb
Clark, Idaho	Langer	Reynolds
Clark, Mo.	Lodge	Robertson

Scrugham	Thomas, Okla.	Wherry
Shipstead	Tobey	White
Smith	Tydings	Wiley
Taft	Van Nuys	Willis
Thomas, Idaho	Walsh	Wilson

## NOT VOTING—21

Andrews	Eastland	Murray
Barbour	Gerry	Russell
Barkley	Glass	Stewart
Butler	Green	Truman
Chandler	Guffey	Wagner
Chavez	McKellar	Wallgren
Downey	Mead	Wheeler

So Mr. PEPPER's amendment to the amendment of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, assuming that the substitute offered by me did not seem preferable to the pending amendment, in the opinion of the Senate, I think all of us will agree that with further study the Committee on Military Affairs, which has been holding long hearings on the whole subject of manpower, can produce something more comprehensive and complete as a solution of the problem than this highly unfair and unsatisfactory bill in its present condition. I therefore move, Mr. President, that the amendment of the Senator from Colorado in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment be recommitted to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator knows full well that the Committee on Military Affairs reported this bill favorably, does he not?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct, but I want the committee to have an opportunity for further consideration of the subject, and I believe it is better that that be done than to pass upon it finally here in its present form. So I move that the bill be recommitted to the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it may be appropriate to say that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs did not report the amendment which is now before the Senate as a substitute. The fact of the matter is that what transpired in the committee as well as what has transpired on the floor with respect to this substitute, is in itself an argument for the motion of the Senator from Florida to recommit the bill.

The original Bankhead proposal, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. There it was set aside by its sponsors, and a substitute was adopted in the Committee on Military Affairs by the sponsors. They were in such great doubt about the application of the proposed substitute to the problem which the country confronts that for a time they were on the point of accepting an amendment which had been proposed to deal with the matter in a different way. However, after they had agreed to report the substitute, the following day, or 2 or 3 days thereafter, they abandoned the substitute which had been recommended by a majority of 9 against 7.

Not only was that true, Mr. President, but the third substitute, having been distributed to Members of the Senate, was thereafter changed by the sponsors and the amendment offered by the Sen-

ator from Colorado, as I think he will readily acknowledge, was never passed upon at all by the Committee on Military Affairs, but represents a substitute which was presented for the first time upon the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Colorado.

I think this plain history of what transpired is in itself a very persuasive argument for the recommitment of the whole bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida that the bill be recommitted.

Mr. PEPPER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLMAN (when his name was called). I make the same announcement I made on the previous vote, and I shall vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. MAYBANK (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. I understand that if he were present he would vote "nay." I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who, if present, would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I do not know how he would vote if he were present. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are out of the city on official business for the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are out of the city on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] have been called to Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] is paired with the Senator from Tennessee [McKELLAR]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea," and the Senator from Tennessee would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 51, as follows:

## YEAS—23

Austin	Ellender	Overton
Bailey	Gurney	Pepper
Ball	Kilgore	Radcliffe
Brewster	Lodge	Tunnell
Bridges	Maloney	Tydings
Burton	Maybank	Walsh
Byrd	Murdock	White
Danaher	O'Mahoney	

## NAYS—51

Alken	Hayden	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Holman	Scruggam
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bushfield	La Follette	Taft
Capper	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Tobey
Connally	McFarland	Vandenberg
Downey	McNary	Van Nuys
Ferguson	Millikin	Wherry
George	Moore	Wiley
Gillette	Nye	Willis
Hatch	O'Daniel	Wilson
Hawkes	Reed	

## NOT VOTING—22

Andrews	Eastland	Russell
Barbour	Gerry	Stewart
Barkley	Glass	Truman
Bone	Green	Wagner
Butler	Guffey	Wallgren
Chandler	McKellar	Wheeler
Chavez	Mead	
Davis	Murray	

So Mr. PEPPER's motion to recommit the bill was rejected.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HATCH. I do not recall what the unanimous consent request agreement entered into yesterday provided. Is the Senate under its terms to vote on the bill at this time?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unanimous consent request agreement entered into yesterday provided that at the hour of 2:30 o'clock the Senate should vote upon the pending amendment, which is the Johnson amendment to the original committee amendment, and that debate should cease at 2:30 o'clock on all amendments.

Mr. HATCH. But not on the bill itself?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No; simply on the amendments to the bill.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Chair please repeat his statement?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The unanimous consent agreement entered into yesterday provided that all debate upon the pending amendments to the bill should cease at the hour of 2:30 o'clock, and that the Senate should then proceed to vote on all amendments to the bill. The hour of 2:30 o'clock having arrived, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] in the nature of a substitute for the committee substitute.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as on the previous vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HOLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. It is my understanding that if present he would vote as I am about to vote. Therefore I am free to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. MAYBANK (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who if present would vote as I am about to vote. I vote "yea." I wish to announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] would vote "yea," if present.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are out of the city on official business for the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are out of the city on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] have been called to Government departments on matters pertaining to their respective States.

I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and Mr. STEWART], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 23, as follows:

## YEAS—51

Alken	Hayden	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hill	Robertson
Bilbo	Holman	Scruggam
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	La Follette	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Idaho	McClellan	Tobey
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Vandenberg
Connally	McNary	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Walsh
Ferguson	Moore	Wherry
George	Nye	Wiley
Gillette	O'Daniel	Willis
Hawkes	Reed	Wilson

## NAYS—23

Austin	Gurney	Overton
Bailey	Hatch	Pepper
Ball	Kilgore	Radcliffe
Brewster	Lodge	Reynolds
Burton	Maloney	Tunnell
Byrd	Maybank	Tydings
Danaher	Murdock	White
Ellender	O'Mahoney	

## NOT VOTING—22

Andrews	Eastland	Russell
Barbour	Gerry	Stewart
Barkley	Glass	Truman
Bone	Green	Wagner
Butler	Guffey	Wallgren
Chandler	McKellar	Wheeler
Chavez	Mead	
Davis	Murray	

So the amendment of Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment, was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as I understand, we are now about to vote on the bill. Am I correct in my understanding that there is now an opportunity for Senators to state their views on the pending bill?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. No debate is in order at the present time. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I desire to take only a few minutes of the time of the Senate to explain the situation in which I find myself.

I was one of the Senators who joined with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] in the introduction of the pending bill. At that time I thought I had good and sufficient reasons for so doing. However, since the bill was introduced and since the debate which has taken place on the floor of the Senate, I have become definitely convinced that



the passage of the measure would be an error.

I shall not undertake to enumerate all my reasons for that belief. They are many. One of my reasons, Mr. President, for reaching the conclusion which I have reached is that I am convinced that the bill would put the farmers of America in a false light. I believe that it would set them apart as a special class, which the farmers of America do not want, and never have wanted. I believe that the measure would seriously cripple the war effort.

For these and many other reasons which I shall not attempt to enumerate at the present time, I shall, despite the fact that I joined with the Senator from Alabama in introducing the bill, vote against its passage.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, referring particularly to one phrase in the amendment which has just been agreed to, on page 1, line 4, are the words "substantially full time on a farm." The amendment would provide that every registrant who is engaged or employed substantially full time on a farm should be deferred.

Today I received a resolution from the South Dakota Egg and Poultry Association. South Dakota is an agricultural State. The resolution was adopted by the processors of eggs, butter, and poultry, at a meeting held last Thursday, March 11.

In order to obtain food for our armed forces and our civilians, farm products not only must be grown but they must be processed and transported. I have previously stated that we are getting into such a condition that food will not be available to those who must have it. Difficulty already exists because of the introduction into the Senate of the so-called Bankhead measure. I will read from the resolution, which is very brief, and Senators may draw their own conclusions:

*Be it resolved by the board of directors of the South Dakota Egg and Poultry Association, That—*

Whereas a critical shortage has developed in the supply of egg cases in the South Dakota area and produce dealers have in stock only 25 percent of the supply of such cases which they had at this time a year ago; and

Whereas the production of eggs in the South Dakota area has increased 10 percent during the same period; and

**This is the important part:**

Whereas manufacturers of egg cases are not able to increase their production of egg cases to meet the demand because of the low ceiling price established on veneer, and also because of the present labor problems which labor problems are occasioned by the fact that workers are being called to serve in the armed forces—

I digress to say that their workers will not be deferred under the amendment just agreed to.

I continue reading:

and are leaving present employment to accept jobs in defense plants, and also some employees are making plans to accept jobs on farms because of the present farm labor deferment bill which has been introduced in the United States Senate, and, as a result of said

factors, together with the factor that such employees are not now classed as engaged in essential war industry, the manufacturers of such egg cases cannot maintain sufficient labor to produce the required number of egg cases, and specific attention is called to the fact that on account of the above-mentioned conditions South Dakota manufacturers of egg cases are running on a capacity of about 50 percent of their normal production and are not in position to increase their production, and, in fact, if the above conditions continue, may be compelled to curtail the same, which specific instance is given as illustrative, and the same condition prevails elsewhere, as is evidenced by the fact that South Dakota produce dealers have attempted to supply their additional needs from manufacturers of egg cases located in other areas, and have been unable to purchase such requirements from them.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. BANKHEAD and Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLMAN (when his name was called). Making the same announcement which I made previously, I will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MAYBANK (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]. Not knowing how he would vote, I transfer the pair to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who would vote "yea," if present, and I will vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] who is absent on business of the Senate. I am not advised as to how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and will vote. I vote "yea." The Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" if present.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] are out of the city on official business for the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are out of the city on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Mississippi

[Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate National Defense.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] has been called to one of the Government departments on matters pertaining to his State.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] has been called from the Senate on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]; the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY]; the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN]; the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY]; and the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] and Mr. STEWART, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] would vote "yea." The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and Mr. GREEN, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 50, nays 24, as follows:

#### YEAS—50

Aiken	Hill	Robertson
Bankhead	Holman	Scruggs
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	La Follette	Taft
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	McClellan	Tobey
Connally	McFarland	Vandenberg
Davis	McNary	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Walsh
Ferguson	Moore	Wherry
George	Nye	Wiley
Gillette	O'Daniel	Willis
Hawkes	Reed	Wilson
Hayden	Revercomb	

#### NAYS—24

Austin	Ellender	Overton
Bailey	Gurney	Pepper
Ball	Hatch	Radcliffe
Brewster	Kilgore	Reynolds
Bridges	Lodge	Tunnell
Burton	Malone	Tydings
Byrd	Murdock	Wagner
Danaher	O'Mahoney	White

#### NOT VOTING—22

Andrews	Butler	Eastland
Barbour	Chandler	Gerry
Barkley	Chavez	Glass
Bone	Clark, Idaho	Green

Guffey  
McKellar  
Maybank  
Mead

Murray  
Russell  
Stewart  
Truman

Wallgren  
Wheeler

So the bill S. 729 was passed.

**MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED  
BILLS SIGNED**

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Taylor, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 788. An act to amend title I of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, and the Veterans Regulations to provide for rehabilitation of disabled veterans, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 133. An act to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

**CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN PUBLIC  
WORKS FOR THE NAVY**

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Calendar No. 83, House bill 1692, to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 1692) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1692) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief explanation. The bill is one of a series of naval public works authorization bills, beginning with the special act, the naval air base bill, approved April 25, 1939, providing for the construction of the necessary shore facilities to build, equip, repair, and maintain the ships and aircraft, and to train, recruit, and hospitalize naval and Marine Corps personnel. The increase in the number of ships, aircraft, and personnel of the Navy automatically results in an obligation to construct additional shore facilities. This bill, therefore, like previous bills, is necessary because of the steady increase in the Navy which is constantly taking place, and is in contemplation for future increase in the Navy.

If this bill is enacted, the shore facilities of the Navy will be kept in step with the growth of the Navy in ships, aircraft, and personnel.

With the Appropriation Act of May 25, 1939, which made available \$63,000,000 to provide for the beginning of an aviation base program, there has been made available to the Navy Department, in

cash and contract authorizations, a total of \$4,211,872,556 for public works, public utilities, and collateral expenses.

Of this vast amount, all but \$34,798,850 has been obligated, and this unobligated balance will be obligated by April 1, 1943.

The pending bill authorizes additional appropriations amounting to \$1,256,607,000. It is estimated that contracts amounting to approximately \$250,000,000 will be made in the fiscal year 1943 and that the remainder will be contracted for in the next fiscal year.

The bill also requires the Secretary of the Navy to report to the Senate and House Naval Affairs Committees all prospective acquisitions of land under the authority conferred by it.

The bill also provides that contracts may be entered into by negotiation, as distinguished from advertising and bidding.

Categories of projects are included in the bill. The break-down of each such category is as follows:

**FLEET FACILITIES**

Fleet facilities to be provided out of the Public Works fund included in this bill, \$67,900,000.

The type of facilities covered by this heading are:

(a) General expansion of fleet operating facilities: This item will permit expansion of existing facilities for serving the fleet and will provide for additional piers for berthing vessels, barracks for crews of ships operating out of the various bases, and messing facilities for such personnel.

(b) Amphibious training facilities: Large-scale expansion in amphibious training facilities is taking place. Only a short time ago there was only one amphibious training facility in operation. The number is steadily increasing.

(c) Section bases: Additional construction is required at the section bases now that local defense craft and vessels of the sea frontiers are properly serviced. Certain section bases are used for escort vessels.

(d) Emergency mooring equipment and navigation aids: Expanded mooring facilities are necessary for fleet anchorages and to provide facilities for assembling convoys.

(e) Harbor improvements in connection with fleet operating facilities, including dredging.

(f) Convoy and escort bases: Our military advances are constantly extending American lines of supply reaching over two oceans, and the development of convoy-escort bases is necessary.

(g) Motor torpedo-boat bases.

A summary of the fleet facilities and the amounts needed for same is as follows:

General expansion of fleet operating facilities.....	\$10,000,000
Amphibious training facilities.....	8,000,000
Section bases.....	5,000,000
Harbor-entrance control posts.....	900,000
Shore signal stations.....	600,000
Coastal look-out and mine watching stations.....	400,000

Motor-torpedo-boat bases.....	\$7,000,000
Emergency mooring equipment and navigational aids.....	8,000,000
Harbor improvements in connection with fleet operating facilities, including dredging.....	8,000,000
Convoy and escort bases.....	20,000,000

Total..... 67,900,000

The funds requested under this heading provide for the expansion of existing operational aviation stations, expansion of existing aviation-training stations, further development of a naval air transport service, and the expansion of lighter-than-air bases in the continental limits of the United States.

A table regarding aviation facilities is as follows:

Operating stations:	
4 new stations.....	\$18,700,000
Expansion of 72 stations.....	78,373,095
Training stations, expansion of 39 stations.....	59,876,905
Naval air transport expansion:	
1 new station.....	10,000,000
Expansion of 6 new stations.....	30,000,000
Lighter-than-air stations: 6 new stations.....	26,050,000
Total.....	223,000,000

**STORAGE FACILITIES**

Five million three hundred and fifty thousand dollars is required for storage facilities. It is planned that this money shall be used for the expansion of 13 existing stations.

**LIQUID FUEL STORAGE FACILITIES**

The total amount authorized is \$10,350,000.

Expansion of 1 fuel oil depot at an estimated cost of.....	\$7,200,000
Emergency fire protection of above-ground fuel storage at 32 existing stations at an estimated cost of.....	1,000,000
Additional aviation gasoline storage at 41 existing stations at an estimated cost of.....	2,150,000
Total.....	10,350,000

**MARINE CORPS HOUSING AND TRAINING FACILITIES**

Under this heading are:

- (a) Additional covered storage for 5 existing Marine Corps stations.
- (b) Housing for Women's Reserve.
- (c) Additional training facilities.

**Ordnance storage facilities**

Increased ammunition loading facilities at naval ammunition depots.....	\$4,950,000
One (new) naval ammunition depot.....	25,000,000
Additional road construction at naval ammunition depots.....	2,000,000
Naval torpedo firing range.....	7,000,000
Additional storage facilities at naval ammunition depots.....	5,150,000
Deperming and degaussing stations.....	2,900,000
Naval net depots.....	3,000,000
Total.....	50,000,000

**PERSONNEL TRAINING AND HOUSING FACILITIES**

This class of projects includes confinement space for prisoners, Women's Reserve personnel facilities, quarters for bachelor officers, receiving station and training station facilities, recreation facilities, chapels, schools, and so forth. A



table regarding personnel training and housing facilities is as follows:

Additional facilities for confinement of minor offenders at 6 existing stations at an estimated cost of.....	\$915,000
Expansion of 2 existing naval prisons at an estimated cost.....	400,000
Expansion of Women's Reserve personnel facilities, 9 locations, at an estimated cost of.....	832,000
Construction of bachelor officers' quarters at 15 existing stations at an estimated cost of.....	1,440,000
Expansion of receiving station and training facilities at 12 locations at an estimated cost of.....	14,455,000
Development of outdoor and covered recreation facilities at 22 locations of estimated cost.....	3,578,000
Construction of chapels at 16 locations at an estimated cost.....	900,000
Expansion of naval training schools at 7 locations at an estimated cost of.....	6,000,000
Expansion of preflight training facilities at 25 institutions at an estimated cost of.....	1,500,000
Expansion of facilities at colleges for advancement of the college program at 60 institutions at an estimated cost of.....	2,500,000
Development of anti-aircraft training centers at 10 locations at an estimated cost.....	500,000
Housing and technical library facilities at 1 location at estimated cost of.....	100,000
Total.....	33,120,000

The table regarding hospital facilities is as follows:

#### Hospital facilities

Annual repair program: General repairs and improvements at 46 locations at an estimated cost of.....	\$7,195,000
Bed facilities, construction, extension, and acquisition:	
Expansion of hospital facilities to increase bed capacity 11,000 beds on existing hospital sites at 9 locations, at an estimated cost of.....	51,960,000
One new hospital for 1,000 beds at an estimated cost of.....	4,450,000
Lease, acquisition, and development of existing facilities to be converted into hospitals for 8,000 at an estimated cost of.....	2,400,000
Total.....	66,005,000

#### SHORE RADIO FACILITIES

Includes the construction of two new radio stations. Total expense for these facilities, \$3,500,000.

#### Naval Research Laboratory

An additional research laboratory building, the same as now under construction.....	\$500,000
Warehouse.....	105,000
Utility building to provide space for station plumbers, electricians, etc., which will have to be moved out of their present quarters in the shops building.....	90,000
Additional space at Chesapeake Bay annex, either in the form of a small laboratory or storage building, depending upon the trend of the development.....	55,000
Total.....	750,000

#### Miscellaneous structures

Miscellaneous structures..... \$33,000,000

The extensions and improvements contemplated under this item are as follows:

Construction of new, and improvements and extensions to existing water-supply systems.....	\$7,500,000
Improvement and extension of sewage-disposal systems and sanitary facilities.....	1,500,000
Malaria control at various locations where considered necessary.....	1,000,000
Shore communication cables and equipment.....	1,000,000
Improvement of power supplies.....	5,000,000
Improvement of distributing systems.....	4,000,000
Conversion of fuel-oil burning facilities.....	5,000,000
Miscellaneous and unforeseen structures and facilities.....	8,000,000
Total.....	33,000,000

#### PASSIVE DEFENSE

This item is for \$15,000,000, and provides for the continuation of the program of passive defense, including camouflage, black-out, security, and other like facilities.

#### ADVANCE BASES

This is the largest item of all in this bill. It is for \$720,000,000. This fund is necessary to continue the advance-base construction, and the purchase of supplies and equipment for overseas operations. It involves work of a strictly confidential nature, the details of which cannot be made public.

Mr. President, I repeat that a bill similar to this is annually presented for the approval of Congress by the Navy Department. It deals with the plans which the Navy has made for the expansion, enlargement, and extension of its shore facilities, due, as I have said, to the fact that as the number of naval vessels increases, as the number of aircraft increases there must be a corresponding increase in the hospitalization facilities, in buildings and barracks for housing the enlisted personnel, and in new bases and other facilities.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Calling the Senator's attention to lines 9 to 13, inclusive, on page 2 of the bill, one finds a very interesting provision:

*Provided, That the approximate cost indicated for each of the classes of projects enumerated above may, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, be varied upward or downward but the total cost shall not exceed \$1,256,607,000.*

I assume that some official of the Navy Department came before the Committee on Naval Affairs and purported to justify these items?

Mr. WALSH. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. In the course of explaining the need for the individual items, did he submit only estimates of the intended cost?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, sir; largely estimates.

Mr. DANAHER. He did not submit exact figures, then, for the respective facilities to be constructed?

Mr. WALSH. My judgment is that a number of the officers of the Navy gather together all the proposals and recommendations from various district officers of the Navy throughout the country, decide what they believe is essential for public works during the next fiscal year, make the best estimate they can of the amount required, and ask for the authorization of that amount. Of course when they come before the Committee on Appropriations, under the authorization, they are expected to present their plans and a more definite and accurate estimate of what the cost will be.

Mr. DANAHER. But in any case whoever represented the Navy convinced the committee that there should be language in the bill to authorize an "upward or a downward" revision of the projects by class?

Mr. WALSH. Such a provision is in nearly every naval authorization bill, and it is requested by the Navy Department because of their conviction that, after they start on projects, the cost may increase or decrease, that there may be need of additional money for a particular project, and they want the authority to divert money from one project to another, with the permission of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DANAHER. Was the committee given any figures at all to indicate the amount recaptured by the Navy under the renegotiation of contracts provision?

Mr. WALSH. I have no recent information along that line.

Mr. DANAHER. I saw reported in the press 2 or 3 weeks ago a release, which, I take it, came from the Navy Department, to the effect that about \$1,000,000,000 has already been saved under the renegotiation of contracts program. Does the Senator have any figures along that line?

Mr. WALSH. I have the earlier figures, but I have not had the figures for recent months. My impression, however, is that that amount must include sums saved under renegotiation made by the War Department as well as by the Navy Department. I am surprised to learn that any such figure as that has been returned to the Navy through the renegotiation of contracts, but I know that the Navy has saved hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. Of course, I want the Senator to understand that I do not assert as a fact that there has been any such sum as a billion dollars recaptured by the Navy, but I remember that I saw in the press a report to the effect that about a billion dollars had been withheld from contractors under the renegotiation program.

Mr. WALSH. I think that is an approximately accurate statement of the total amount of money that has been

recaptured under the renegotiation of contracts provision both by the Army and the Navy.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the Senator's understanding that any part of the funds so recaptured under the renegotiation provision might be available to meet the cost of the appropriations authorized in this bill?

Mr. WALSH. The Senator will recall the discussion on this subject previously—

Mr. DANAHER. I do.

Mr. WALSH. As I understand, the money recaptured does not go into the Public Treasury but is returned to the Navy Department and is included in the reduction of the cost of a particular project by the Navy Department, and money thus returned is available to them for certain expenditure by them in the same category for which the money was authorized by the Committee on Appropriations. In other words, if there is a contract made for the building of a certain number of destroyers and there is a substantial sum of money recaptured, the money recaptured becomes available to the Navy Department to build, if it has authority from the Committee on Appropriations, additional destroyers, without going back for an authorization from Congress.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. DANAHER. I have used the word "recapture" with reference to the renegotiation program when, to be technically accurate, I should have referred to amounts withheld under that program which revert to the Navy for its subsequent use on additional projects or purposes for which the money was originally authorized. So I will say to the Senator if, for example, the Navy were to build miscellaneous structures, let us say, for which they estimated \$33,000,000, but, under the renegotiation provisions, they found they could build them for, let us say, \$30,000,000, then the 10 percent saved, or \$3,000,000, roughly, would still be available to the Navy under the renegotiation sections of the law for use for the building of miscellaneous structures only. Is not that so?

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. May I have an answer first to the question?

Mr. WALSH. As I understand, the money saved would remain in the possession of the Navy Department until the end of the fiscal year. At the end of the fiscal year the Navy Department must come before the Committee on Appropriations and ask for new appropriations, but the money which is available and not contracted for or spent is taken into account by the Committee on Appropriations in providing the new appropriations for the next fiscal year.

Mr. DANAHER. Yet, under the renegotiation section any balances withheld from a previous contract could be used only for the purpose for which the money was originally appropriated.

Mr. WALSH. That is exactly my understanding.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I thought I might throw some light on the question which has been raised, because we had some testimony in the last 2 or 3 days before the Appropriations Committee on that question.

Mr. WALSH. I gladly yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. OVERTON. Where a contract has been completed and payment has been made to the contractor, refunds on negotiation revert to the Treasury; but, where payment has not been made to the contractor, it is retained by the Navy Department, simply because the Navy Department has not expended it. It is just as if it had negotiated in the beginning for a lesser price. Therefore, where there is a reduction of price as a result of renegotiation before any payment is made, the amount represented by the reduction remains available to the Navy Department.

Mr. WALSH. It is just as if the original contract was the amount the Navy Department had to pay, and the Department had a credit for what it was to receive under renegotiation. Is not that correct?

Mr. OVERTON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. In other words, the Navy charges itself not with the contract that it made and from which it has been enabled to have money returned to it through renegotiation, but the Navy charges itself with the amount of the contract as originally drawn, with the deductions which have come through renegotiation?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

I think the Senator from Connecticut wanted to know how much has been recaptured.

Mr. DANAHER. I should have said "withheld" rather than "recaptured," though I did use the word "recaptured."

Mr. OVERTON. The total saving in process now is \$934,000,000. Of that amount \$253,000,000 will be in the form of refunds—that is, cash paid back to the Government; \$531,000,000 will be reductions in the price of goods and munitions already ordered, and \$150,000,000 will be voluntary reductions in the form of decreases in prices or reductions in profit by the contractor, making a total of \$934,000,000.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs a question.

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. We are now making special studies in the Military Affairs Committee relating to manpower, and I should like to ask the Senator whether the activities represented by this authorization would involve the employment of men and women as civilians working for the Navy in addition to the number who have been estimated as necessary for the year 1943?

Mr. WALSH. Somewhat, undoubtedly; but the contracts which were made a year ago are maturing all the time, and the labor involved in carrying out those contracts becomes available for use in performing contracts for the next

fiscal year. But undoubtedly in some particulars there will be a demand for additional labor, and particularly labor in connection with the newer projects, such as the ones referred to last, the advance bases, for which there is authorized an appropriation of \$750,000,000, which, as the Senator knows, covers the construction of bases on the other side of the Atlantic and in the Pacific. As our troops advance, as our efforts to gain control of the possessions of the enemy go forward, as we succeed, advance bases must be built at once, and it is a very extensive and very expensive and a very hazardous job. Incidentally, many people believe that some of the best work that has been done during the war has been done by former civilians who are mechanics, and who are known as the construction battalions, who have, almost under fire of the enemy, constructed the air bases and the harbor facilities which were needed to carry on a military objective.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I have before me an estimate of the additional men who will be needed for the year 1943, that is, up to December 31, 1943, and it shows that the Navy will need 180,000, the shipyards 712,500, the manufacturing plants 200,000, shore personnel 10,000, Maritime Commission 3,215, War Shipping 782. Those will be additional men.

Mr. WALSH. What was the second item?

Mr. AUSTIN. The second item was for men in shipyards.

Mr. WALSH. Is that for the Navy or the Maritime Commission, or both?

Mr. AUSTIN. I understand that the figure includes the Maritime Commission and the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, there is a tremendous continuing expansion in shipbuilding, as the Senator knows.

Mr. AUSTIN. In any event, I think the answer the Senator gave previously covers the point.

Mr. WALSH. In other words, the provision is not altogether for new labor, it is for taking over the labor that has been employed on projects during the past year.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is estimated that there will be returned to unemployment at least a million men who were last year engaged in construction work.

Mr. WALSH. That surprises me. In other words, we have reached the peak of new construction for military purposes?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. And from now on there will be a gradual decline?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. That is one item which is often forgotten. I have heard much of discussion of the question of manpower during the past 3 weeks, but I had not previously heard that particular item alluded to.

Mr. WALSH. I have heard of reductions in the production of various kinds of ordnance because our production has been so rapid and so steady and so constant that we have reached the peak, and some of the industries which were engaged in supplementing our ordnance



production are having their forces curtailed and are closing down to a degree.

Mr. AUSTIN. This does not relate to that; it relates to building projects, plant facilities, and so forth.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; that is, new industrial plant facilities, expansion of industrial plants.

Mr. AUSTIN. Not entirely that. It includes installations for training, barracks for soldiers, and similar projects.

Mr. WALSH. That is very interesting and enlightening to me. I do not think the public generally appreciates that we have already, to a certain degree and in certain fields, reached the peak of employment and are now coming to face the problem of unemployment.

Mr. AUSTIN. It is an interesting thing for me to remember that I have received letters from unions in the Senator's State, the State of Massachusetts, whose members were during the past year engaged in some type of construction work such as pipe fitting, carpentry, and masonry, who are now idle and are wondering where they are to get jobs. They need the guidance of a government which knows where the demand is for them so that they may be intelligently placed, the right man being put in the right place.

Mr. WALSH. I appreciate the Senator's contribution to the discussion.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I was interested in the questions of the Senator from Connecticut a few minutes ago with reference to renegotiation and withholding. I desired to inquire whether, in the mechanics of renegotiation or withholding, the two words are the same; or is the renegotiation before the withholding, or is the withholding before the renegotiation?

Mr. WALSH. Renegotiation of contracts, as I understand, can take place at any time during the life of the contract, or after the contract has been completed. If it is during the life of the contract, as I understand, the money reverts to the Navy, or to the Army, if it is an Army contract. If renegotiation takes place after the contract is completed, the renegotiated money goes into the Public Treasury. I inquire of the Senator from Louisiana if that is not his understanding.

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. TUNNELL. Then the amounts go direct into the Public Treasury?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment of the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 8, after the word "passive", it is proposed to strike out "defenses" and insert "defense."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to address an inquiry to the able Senator from Massachusetts, in charge of the bill. This is an authorization bill. I assume it was reported by the committee unanimously.

Mr. WALSH. The committee reported the bill unanimously, and in executive session heard at great length the various

officers of all the Navy bureaus, who explained each item in detail, and gave extended reasons as to the necessity for each item.

Mr. McNARY. I am advised that following this bill another, in the hands of the able Senator from Louisiana, will follow, namely, an appropriation bill. I am curious to know whether the appropriation bill is to cover projects authorized in the bill now known as H. R. 1692.

Mr. WALSH. I am inclined to think that some of the items may be included in the appropriation bill the Senator from Louisiana will call up. I note in the report given to us by the Navy Department that they intend to expend, under this authorization, about \$250,000,000 between now and the first of July. The other billion dollars authorized will be included in the appropriation bill for the next fiscal year. The Senator from Louisiana can better answer the question as to whether any items covered by the pending bill are included in the deficiency bill he is to present after this bill shall have been disposed of.

Mr. OVERTON. The appropriation bill on the calendar carries an appropriation of about \$239,740,400.

Mr. WALSH. Authorized by the bill we are now considering?

Mr. OVERTON. Which will be authorized by the bill which the able Senator from Massachusetts has in charge.

Mr. WALSH. The officials of the Navy Department testified before our committee that all the money which they received last year under the authorization for public works activities for the fiscal year ending July 1 would be exhausted by July 1, and that some of the money authorized in the bill before us, approximately \$239,000,000, would be appropriated this year. Is not that the fact?

Mr. OVERTON. It is my understanding that the appropriation bill the Senate will soon take up has only one relation to the bill now under consideration, that is, a contract authorization, authorized by the pending bill, of \$239,000,000, in round figures.

Mr. McNARY. What is the amount of money authorized in the bill now before the Senate?

Mr. WALSH. The amount is \$1,256,607,000. The Navy asked for \$1,500,000,000, which was cut down to the figure I have mentioned.

Mr. McNARY. When did we pass the last authorization bill, relating to the same items specified in the bill now before the Senate?

Mr. WALSH. I do not recall exactly, but approximately last August or September. We did pass a bill, which perhaps the Senator has in mind, on February 15, which became law on February 19, authorizing appropriations for the United States Navy for additional ship repair facilities and for other purposes. The Senator will recall that that bill contained an authorization for \$210,000,000, largely for the building of floating docks. That was the last bill, and was the only other bill of this nature. But that was not for shore facilities; it was for repair of ships, and for floating dock facilities.

Mr. McNARY. What proportion of the money authorized in the bill before the Senate is for shore facilities outside the United States?

Mr. WALSH. Of the \$1,256,000,000?

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. I suppose the main and principal item of \$720,000,000, for advance bases, will all be spent outside the United States. It will be used for bases in Africa, the southern Pacific, and in Japan, when we get there. That is one of the largest items of all. I do not know any of the other items that are outside the continent of the United States.

Mr. McNARY. That is the one large item in the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Yes, it is; and the most important.

Mr. McNARY. What is the amount of money now unexpended and unobligated which might be used for this purpose?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I took the trouble to review the past financial statements in regard to bills of this kind. The Navy Department officials testified that contracts amounting to approximately \$250,000,000 will be made in the fiscal year 1943, and that the remainder will be made in the next fiscal year. Of the amount of money heretofore authorized and appropriated for shore naval establishments all but \$34,798,850 had been obligated, and the unobligated balance the Navy Department said would be obligated by April 1, 1943. The Senator will recall that I set forth an enumeration of all the appropriations made since we started on this program of expenses in 1939. The total amount of authorizations for shore establishments, that is, aside from the building of naval vessels and aircraft, is \$4,211,872,556, and to that now will be added, if the pending bill becomes law, \$1,256,700,000.

Mr. McNARY. Did the full committee approve these items?

Mr. WALSH. Yes; the full committee approved them. A representative of nearly every bureau of the Navy was present and was examined.

Mr. McNARY. Have the hearings been printed?

Mr. WALSH. They have been typed, but not printed, because much of the testimony is of a confidential, secret nature.

Mr. McNARY. Is it available to the Members of the Senate?

Mr. WALSH. Yes, except the testimony with reference to the advance bases. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that the report of the committee is quite complete, and includes practically all the testimony and all the figures presented to the committee, other than those related to the \$720,000,000 for advance bases.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask the Senator if he can tell us the amount of naval appropriations which have been allocated to the lend-lease fund since the enactment of the lend-lease law about 2 years ago? If I remember correctly, recent reports of lend-lease expenditures

show that somewhat more than \$50,000,000 have been unexpended, and it appears, as I recall, that between \$40,000,000,000 and \$50,000,000,000 have been allocated to lend-lease from Army and Navy appropriations. I understand that if it were not allocated, any excess appropriations to the Army and Navy remaining at the end of the fiscal year, or the 2-year period, would go back into the general fund, but when the funds are once allocated they do not go back into the general fund. I wondered why it had been found necessary to allocate such a huge sum to the lend-lease fund, where it can be expended by the Executive Office without much, if any, accounting to the Congress, and why the authorities keep allocating so many billion dollars to the lend-lease fund to be spent by the Executive Office, and then keep coming back to Congress for more appropriations. I am sorry I do not have the lend-lease report with me, but I am sure the Senator from Massachusetts will recall that that matter was brought up once before in connection with an appropriation.

Mr. WALSH. I regret very much that I cannot inform the Senator from Vermont very much about diversions to lend-lease of funds appropriated for the Navy Department. Perhaps the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having in charge the supplemental Navy Department appropriation bill, can give us some information on that subject. I do not know of any diversion.

Mr. AIKEN. A statement about it was contained in the report of the President to the Congress on expenditures of lend-lease funds.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator from Vermont recall what the items were?

Mr. AIKEN. I think the September report showed about fifty-five billion or fifty-six billion dollars of unexpended funds in the lend-lease balance of which approximately \$45,000,000,000 had been allocated from Army and Navy appropriations.

Mr. WALSH. I have no knowledge of that. I can conceive of vessels and materials of the Navy being diverted to some of our allies under the lend-lease provisions of law, and I know in the bill we passed in February we included an amendment which the Senator will perhaps recall, providing that:

Hereafter any ship, boat, barge, or floating drydock of the Navy may be leased in accordance with the act approved March 11, 1941, but not otherwise disposed of, for periods not beyond the termination of the present war, but title thereto shall remain in the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. If I remember correctly the total amount which has been made available for lend-lease purposes is about \$62,000,000,000, of which some \$16,000,000,000 or \$18,000,000,000 has been directly appropriated by the Congress for that purpose, and the remainder allocated from Army and Navy appropriations.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator mean the money itself was allocated from

these appropriations, or material, equipment, or vessels which belonged to and in which there was title on the part of the Army and Navy?

Mr. AIKEN. I think it must be money, because, as I said, the President's report for the quarter ending last fall—September or October—showed an unexpended balance of \$54,000,000,000 or \$55,000,000,000 in the lend-lease fund, approximately \$45,000,000,000 of which had been allocated to lend-lease from Army and Navy appropriations. I wondered why.

Mr. WALSH. We ought to have that information in detail, I will say. I can understand that if the British Army wanted large amounts of certain kinds of munitions in the possession of our own Army or Navy, through the lend-lease authorities they would be able to get them.

Mr. AIKEN. But I think that expenditures for that purpose, or any vessels turned over, would be included in the amount expended rather than in the amount unexpended.

Mr. WALSH. I presume so.

Mr. AIKEN. And it has perplexed me.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who is in charge of the supplemental Navy Department appropriation bill, have any information which he can furnish the Senator from Vermont on this subject?

Mr. OVERTON. The question which the Senator from Vermont has propounded to the Senator from Massachusetts was asked in the course of the hearings on the appropriation bill which will be before the Senate in a few minutes. We were unable to obtain the answers we wanted at the time, but a statement was subsequently furnished and printed in the hearings, which will be found on page 35 of the hearings on the supplemental Navy Department appropriation bill for 1943.

Mr. WALSH. Is it a long statement?

Mr. OVERTON. It is rather long. I can give the totals. The total amount in dollars of material and service transferred is \$901,000,000. Of this, the total on requisitions through the Office of Lend-Lease Administration is \$756,920,000; on requisition direct to the Navy, \$144,140,000. That is what I understand would make the total of the lend-lease payments or contributions by the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. Are those contributions in money or in materials in the possession of the Navy?

Mr. OVERTON. They represent material and service transferred.

Mr. WALSH. That is what I assumed. And they do not represent any diversion of money appropriated?

Mr. OVERTON. No, I think not; but material and service transferred.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. AIKEN. There would be no such amount of diversion, however, as \$50,000,000,000 or \$60,000,000,000?

Mr. WALSH. I did not mean by my last question to refer to the matter concerning which the Senator from Vermont spoke.

Mr. OVERTON. In the table to which I just referred there is another column under the heading "Approved foreign

requisitions," amounting in total to \$8,332,000,000. That figure is broken down in the table.

Mr. WALSH. I wish to say to the Senator from Vermont that I think he has opened up a subject which should engage the attention of the Senate, and I think it would be well if the Senator could obtain more detailed information.

Mr. AIKEN. We have tried to get the information. We have sent for the lend-lease report of last fall.

Mr. WALSH. Does that report give a break-down?

Mr. AIKEN. It gives the source of the lend-lease funds, and, as I have said, I think the direct appropriation by the Congress has been \$16,000,000,000 or \$18,000,000,000, and I believe \$45,000,000,000 has been allocated from Army and Navy appropriations to lend-lease.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not better to say "Army and Navy property," or "Army and Navy services," rather than "appropriations"?

Mr. AIKEN. As I recall, it is funds available. The total amounted to \$62,000,000,000—I am speaking now from memory—\$62,000,000,000 at that time, of which about \$8,000,000,000 had been spent, leaving a balance of \$54,000,000,000 unexpended. I think that is a matter which the Senate should check. If the money appropriation is not actually allocated from the Army and Navy, then we should know that this report does not mean what it says.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I notice that the report states that the appropriation for advance bases, which is more than half of the appropriation, involves work of a strictly confidential nature, the details of which cannot, in the interest of national security, be made public. I wonder if the distinguished Senator can tell us the policy associated with the building of such bases. Are they being built upon land owned by the United States, or held under long-term leases, or is the money to be thrown away at the end of the war? Are the bases to be built on the property of others? I should like to know if there is any policy with regard to the expenditure of the money.

Mr. WALSH. As I understand, the bases are to be built at such places, and in such Territories or lands as the naval and military authorities believe to be essential for our military operations.

Mr. TAFT. I understand that.

Mr. WALSH. Some have already been built in the south Pacific.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder, however, if we are to receive a 90- or 100-year lease, or fee title to the property, so that after the war is over we will still own it, and if anyone else wants it he will at least have to pay us for it, or whether the bases are to be built on someone else's property and will automatically revert to the owner at the end of the war.

Mr. WALSH. Some bases have already been built and abandoned when the operation was finished. I understand most of these bases will be of a temporary nature. After we got possession of



Guadalcanal there was no need for a number of bases which were necessary during the operation. As I understand, it is a continually moving activity. I am not at liberty to state what I understand may be the naval strategy for the Pacific Ocean during the next year. However, I believe that every Senator can appreciate that the operations will be new. They will be undertaken from place to place, from possession to possession. The moment the authorities begin a military operation they have to have bases. I do not know that I can say more.

Mr. TAFT. If there is to be any salvage value at the end of the war, the United States should be entitled to it. These bases are not in effect lend-lease bases for someone else. As I understand, they are built by the United States Navy and owned by the United States Government.

Mr. WALSH. I presume that when the time comes to make peace, due consideration will be given to the fact that we have bases on foreign soil which have been used for military purposes. Either the country to which they revert will compensate us for them, or we will hold them if it is necessary in our plan for world peace.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that in building bases we should take a little extra care to obtain at least 99-year leases, such as we have in connection with our bases in the West Indies, or some protection which would make of them a permanent possession of the United States.

Mr. WALSH. I believe the observations of the Senator from Ohio are timely.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. I am very much interested in the question propounded by the junior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. I do not in any way wish to hamper the war effort, but is there any objection to the pending bill going over for 3 or 4 days so that we can investigate it in connection with the lend-lease program?

Mr. WALSH. I would have to object to that. The Navy Department has been pressing me very strenuously for action upon the bill. It should be acted upon before any appropriation bill is taken up for consideration. I have received telephone messages nearly every day for a week, since the bill has been pending. I have almost reached the conclusion that when Army and Navy bills are reached we should suspend all other bills and take them up without delay.

However, the lend-lease law is something that we cannot change. Already there is authority to give materials and service by the United States Navy if our allies deem it necessary. Our allies are fighting the war with us. If our allies, or board of strategy conducting the war, desire to take a part of our Navy, they can do so. I hope the Senator will not insist upon his request.

Mr. LANGER. I do not believe it is fair to the Senate, with only a few days'

notice, to ask for a vote on a \$5,000,000,000 bill. I confess I do not know anything about it. I think Senators are entitled to be given time enough to examine into the question, regardless of what the Army and Navy want to have done. We should know whether we have \$5,000,000,000 or not.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Vermont has not raised the question for the purpose of opposing the bill. He is seeking information as to what the Navy is surrendering to lend-lease authorities, and what the Army is surrendering to lend-lease authorities. It is a very appropriate inquiry, but I do not think it should prevent action on a bill on which a committee of the Senate, dealing with all the questions concerning it, have unanimously reported. Every dollar which is to be spent is set forth in the report, except in connection with advance bases.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am a member of the Naval Affairs Committee. If we should give out complete information as to what is to happen with respect to advance bases we would give all the military and naval information which the Axis Powers are seeking.

Mr. WALSH. We would declare and disclose today our strategy for next year, and to the end of the war.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct, and that is the very reason why it should not be done. There are many military secrets which the Senate of the United States cannot know; and if the Senate is to know what the strategy of the war is to be, the Axis Powers will also know our military and naval strategy.

Mr. WALSH. That is true. I sympathize with the Senator. It is a large bill. It is painful to me to go into the pockets of American people for several billion dollars. It is part and parcel of the war effort, and we cannot hinder it. We must give and sacrifice to obtain victory. Our armed forces are increasing every day. We must have places to build hospitals, storage facilities, water supply systems, sewerage systems, and so forth. The Senate committee, composed of Democrats and Republicans, serious, conscientious Members of this body, have given time to the matter and believe that the appropriation is necessary for our war effort, and have recommended its consideration at this time.

Mr. LANGER. I realize that, but I am interested in the question of the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. WALSH. Suppose we were given all this lend-lease information. What would it have to do with the pending bill? I do not know how much has been given away under that law by the Army and the Navy. However, I know it has nothing to do with this bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not question the necessity of the bill.

Mr. WALSH. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Mr. AIKEN. However, I was desirous of finding out how much has been allocated from previous appropriations to lend-lease where they are out of the

reach of Congress. I have been unable to get a copy of the report of September 1942, which has those figures, which I cannot recall. I have the report of March 11 of this year, which shows that direct lend-lease appropriations have been \$18,410,000,000. Transfers authorized from other appropriations—principally the War Department—are \$35,970,000,000. Of that amount, \$3,000,000,000 is from the second supplemental Navy Department appropriation. Eight hundred million dollars is from departments other than the War Department. There is evidently \$35,970,000,000 for cash expenditures, because below that item appears another list with the value of ships which may be leased from the Maritime Commission. The amount is about \$5,000,000,000. Then it says:

Navy Department, Naval Appropriation Act, 1942 (no limitation as to amount).

It appears that \$35,970,000,000 was transferred from these appropriations to the lend-lease account. If that be so, it seems to me to be a tremendous amount to put out of the reach of Congress.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator understand that the lend-lease authority can demand or request anything from the Army or Navy Departments that it sees fit, and the Departments have the authority to grant it in carrying on the war?

Mr. AIKEN. That seems to be provided for.

Mr. WALSH. The items in the list represent American money that has been expended for the purpose of complying with the requests of the lend-lease authorities.

Mr. AIKEN. I repeat that I am not questioning the necessity for the appropriation.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that. However, I think the Senator must first of all understand what the lend-lease authority is. The Lend-Lease Administration has authority to go to a department of the Government and ask for what it wants, and if our authorities decide they are entitled to it they give it to them. Is there any doubt about that? I am sure there can be no doubt about it.

Mr. AIKEN. If we are spending for lend-lease at the rate of eight or nine billion dollars a year, then the appropriations to that department are sufficient to last for several years. I was merely questioning the wisdom of making appropriations so far ahead. I repeat that I am not questioning the necessity for the passage of the bill, but I thought it would be a good time to get information if possible.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I desire to make one observation with respect to the question raised by the Senator from Ohio a moment ago in connection with advance bases.

I can understand that perhaps in certain areas it might be advisable and perhaps time would be sufficient in which to do what the Senator has suggested. However, I cite the cases of Guadalcanal and Henderson Field. If we are to be

required to negotiate for 30 or 60 days for an advance base, we might as well forget about building any type of defense in the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. WALSH. The sites for advance bases are frequently taken by force. Our forces are going to invade those countries and lands and establish bases against the opposition of the enemy and in the face of their fire.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, the Senator is absolutely correct; and it seems to me to be foolish to talk about negotiating with some country with respect to advance bases when we are in this world catastrophe, when the world is on fire, and we are in the center of the conflagration. Perhaps there may be some bases away from an active zone of fighting as to which the situation might demand or require negotiations or something of the kind referred to; but certainly in the Pacific Ocean—and I do not know where all the advance bases are going to be—

Mr. WALSH. If we told where they are going to be we would be disclosing the whole strategy of the war.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct. We know that a number of them are in the Pacific Ocean. Ultimately we must take the offensive, in fact, we are now on the offensive. Every time we make a move toward Japan we must establish an advance base; indeed, we must do so beforehand, as the Senator from Massachusetts has so well stated. Before we go into a place and take it and establish a base, we do not have time to talk about negotiating with someone.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me say that of course what the Senator from Illinois has said is perfectly true with respect to some types of bases; but we are to spend \$720,000,000 for advance bases. Under that program there probably will be some bases costing \$100,000,000. Certainly, if we are going to make contracts to spend \$100,000,000 for a base in Ceylon for an operation against Burma, we can spend a little extra time in obtaining a lease or conveyance of the property on which we are going to spend the \$100,000,000. We did not spend \$100,000,000 in the course of a naval offensive on Guadalcanal, for instance. I do not suppose the total expenditures there amount to \$5,000,000. But when we make expenditures of this character it seems to me that we may well take the trouble to see that what we build is permanently protected under our ownership.

If I remember correctly, I think the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts referred to Africa when he first spoke of the bases. If we were going to establish a naval base in French North Africa—not a base of the kind that is built when forces are on the offensive, but, for instance, a base at a place like Casablanca—I think that any conservative businessman would see to it that he was building the base on our property or on property we had leased.

I assume that is the policy, as a matter of fact. Certainly it seems to me it should be the policy, if it is not. After the last war we had considerable difficulty in France when we came to try to realize on some of the things we had

built there; and what we got for them did not amount to 2 cents, as compared to what we had spent on them.

When we appropriate \$720,000,000, I think the policy should be to see that our investment is adequately protected, so far as it can be, so that its value or salvage value, if there is any after the war is over, will be returned to the American people.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Louisiana reminds me—and I want this matter presented for the information of the Senator from Illinois and also that of the Senator from Ohio—that most of the advance bases will be of a temporary nature, and after the job of taking care of the military activities is finished, they will be abandoned. Does the Senator recall that testimony—that they are not to be of a permanent character?

Mr. LUCAS. I think the Senator is correct in that respect.

In answer to the Senator from Ohio, let me say that I do not altogether disagree with the premise on which he has proceeded, but I do say with all the seriousness which I possess, that we are in a war in which our liberties and all we have or ever expect to have are threatened by aggressor nations. Of course there are times when in the Senate we quibble about perhaps a small matter that will not mean very much one way or the other in the final analysis; but what we are attempting to do, and the one real objective toward which all of us should look—and I know that all Members of the Senate do so—is the winning of the war. The question of 99-year leases, which I have constantly heard mentioned on the floor of the Senate, will not mean anything 99 years or even 6 years from now unless we are absolutely successful and victorious in the great struggle in which we are all at present engaged.

I am not one who is going to quibble much about attempting to negotiate leases with other governments in connection with the spending of \$720,000,000 on advance bases.

"Advance bases" means exactly what the words imply. They are not bases back of the fighting line; they are advance bases. When our forces are advancing they do not take much time to confer with our allies as to whether or not we are going to have some sort of a vested right in the particular \$30,000,000 or \$50,000,000 we are spending in order to build a base in a proper spot from which to overtake the enemy. Overtaking the enemy at that particular point, just as we did at Guadalcanal, at the proper time and proper moment may save the lives of thousands upon thousands of American boys, and ultimately may save the liberty of the American people.

Mr. President, sometimes I think that the war is so far away from the American people that I wonder, when I listen to arguments on street corners and arguments in the corridors of the Senate and the House, whether the Senate itself, and, sometimes, the Congress itself does not talk too much and too long about the little details, and not enough about the really big things that are involved.

I do not say that by way of any criticism at all, Mr. President; I merely feel that way deep down in my heart, because I honestly believe that America still is in danger, that the war is going to be a long, long one, and that in the final analysis practically all the resources, all the patriotism, and all the wealth of America must be expended if we are to win the struggle in which we are at present engaged.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I appreciate the force of the observation made by the Senator from Illinois. There is not much more to say, except that, while we all agree with the sentiments expressed by the very able Senator from Illinois, and who of course is a very valuable member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I think that many of the questions which have been asked—and I welcome them, and I am glad to have had them presented—indicate that, although we are all heart and soul striving to win the war, we must not overlook the duty which rests upon us not to make it cost any more than necessary, and to be cautious and careful in seeing that whatever rights the American people possess shall be preserved, protected, and defended.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not disagree with the Senator on that premise at all.

Mr. WALSH. I know the Senator does not.

Mr. LUCAS. As I recall, the committee cut down the original request approximately \$250,000,000.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; the House committee did.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. A few minutes ago the Senator from Massachusetts picked up a bill which the Congress passed in February of this year and read the section which appeared at the close of the measure. As I recall the section, it could be paraphrased to read that, under the terms of the language, the lend-lease law and any other law on the statute books notwithstanding, we would be authorized to transfer naval vessels to any Allied power—or words to that effect. Is that correct?

Mr. WALSH. Yes. The bill dealt with the construction of floating drydocks.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. That is a new departure for the Navy. We have a few floating drydocks already built, but we are going to build a great many more of them. They accompany the fleet. They will go into the harbors; and when injury or damage occurs to a naval vessel, the vessel will be put in one of the floating docks, and will be repaired right there. We shall build some of them for our allies. It was feared that if a provision of this kind were not included, title would pass. So the language of the amendment to which the Senator has referred guaran-



tees that after the war is over there will not be any passing of title to the floating drydocks which may be harbored in ports all over the world.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WALSH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. DANAHER. In 1917 a law was passed providing that no warship could be outfitted in this country and turned over to any belligerent nation. So far as I know, that law is still on the statute books. It was in no way involved in the section in the February 1943 measure to which the Senator has referred; is that correct?

Mr. WALSH. No, not at all. The Senator refers to our disposition of naval vessels when we were neutral, or were supposed to be neutral; is that correct?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. That has nothing to do with the matter at all. The amendment to which I referred was proposed in order to take particular care and caution that as to our floating drydocks which will be located in the waters of all the seas, and in harbors everywhere, if they are used by our allies—and they can be used by them, of course, and should be used by them—the title will not pass from the Navy. That is the purpose.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I think we should have a vote on the pending bill now.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, relating what I am about to say to the remarks with which the Senator from Massachusetts closed his presentation of the bill, I should like to say that a few days ago I found in the New London Evening Day a column written by Mr. Ray Tucker, a noted Washington correspondent whose articles are syndicated under the title "News Behind the News—Washington and National Activities in Government and Politics."

In this particular article he made reference to a letter which had been written by a friend of his whom he had not seen for many years. The friend was Mr. Arthur D. Howden Smith. Mr. Smith may be known to a good many here as the author of the volume Mr. House of Texas. As collaborator with Colonel House during the World War in many of his ventures, and as a member of the staff of the New York Evening Post from 1905 to 1918, Mr. Smith had had many opportunities to meet the world's great and near great.

It developed, from Mr. Tucker's article, that Smith had at one time been a very close acquaintance of a gentleman named Philip Kerr, who is better known to us as Lord Lothian. Further, Mr. Tucker wrote, under date of May 2, 1940:

Mr. Smith had addressed a communication to Lord Lothian.

I was so interested in what Mr. Tucker had described as the events which followed that particular letter that I am going to ask unanimous consent from the Senate that Mr. Tucker's entire piece be printed in the RECORD at this point.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fighters: A noted New York reporter was the author of the arrangement whereby we gave Great Britain 50 destroyers in return for bases in the Atlantic littoral. His name is Arthur D. Howden Smith. He worked beside the writer 20 years ago on the old, internationalistic New York Evening Post, which was then owned and controlled by Thomas W. Lamont, of J. P. Morgan & Co.

The famous transaction was not consummated until September 3, 1940. But the following private correspondence discloses that the deal was in the making months before that date. Behind-the-scenes facts are quite illuminating, despite Pearl Harbor. On May 2, 1940, Mr. Smith sent this message to his old friend, Lord Lothian, then British Ambassador to Washington and formerly Lloyd George's secretary:

"I had the pleasure of knowing you as Philip Kerr many years ago when I was associated with the late Colonel House, whose final biography I shall publish in September. If you chance upon it, you will find it a startling, accurate forecast of what is happening. It should be of service to the Allied cause. But that is not really the occasion of this letter.

"It occurs to me that the Admiralty will have increasing need for escort vessels as warfare spreads. Our Navy has a large reserve of wartime destroyers, somewhere between 100 and 150. They are serviceable vessels and they have been adequately maintained. Forty or fifty were reconditioned for use in the neutrality patrol last fall.

"Am I taking an undue liberty, as a private citizen, if I suggest that it might be possible for the Admiralty to purchase a number of these vessels for convoy service? I see no difference between such a demonstration of 'benevolent neutrality' by the administration and the waiving of warplane contracts in the Allies' favor."

The envoy's reply to Arthur's suggestion is significant. He admits that London could use a few sub sinkers, but notes that the sale or swap would be somewhat illegal. His communication is dated May 17, 1940 (Mr. Hull did not publicize the proceedings until September 3 of that year).

"MY DEAR ARTHUR HOWDEN SMITH: Thank you for your kind letter of May 2. I well remember our previous meetings. I would dearly like, if I have the leisure, to read in September your biography of that wise man, Colonel House.

"As to your suggestion about the destroyers, it is an interesting one, and I am passing it on to our naval people.

"But you will no doubt realize that international law forbids a neutral government to sell warships to a belligerent. American airplanes—this was before the fall of France (editor's note)—are, of course, being sold to the French and British Governments by private and not by governmental firms.

"Thank you for your suggestion, and with kindest regards.

"LOTHIAN."

Before his late lordship died, the Lend-Lease Act was passed. So he got his destroyers, his planes, food, and also American buck privates. It is not generally known, but there are almost as many Yankee fighters in empire territory as there are Britishers.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I communicated with Mr. Tucker to ascertain where Mr. Smith was at the present time, and discovered that he is right here in Washington, as a member of the public-relations section of the American Red Cross. I went down to see him and asked whether by any chance he still had the

correspondence to which Mr. Tucker had referred, particularly the reply which had been sent by Lord Lothian. He loaned them to me, to the end that I might cause them to be photostated, and I hold in my hand a photostat of the original carbon copy of a letter dated May 2, 1940, from Mr. Arthur D. Howden Smith to Lord Lothian, and a photostat of the original reply, dated May 17, 1940, from Lord Lothian to Mr. Smith. I shall read them for the information of the Senate, and for their historical interest. The letter from Mr. Smith is as follows:

HOLLYWOOD, CALIF., May 2, 1940.

His Excellency the Right

Honorable the MARQUIS OF LOTHIAN,

The British Embassy, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR LORD LOTHIAN: I had the pleasure of knowing you as Philip Kerr many years ago when I was associated with the late Colonel House, whose final biography I shall publish in September. If you chance upon it, you will find it a startlingly accurate forecast of what is happening. It should be of service to the Allied cause. But that is not really the occasion of this letter.

It has occurred to me that the Admiralty will have increasing need for escort vessels as warfare spreads. Our Navy has a large reserve of wartime destroyers, somewhere between 100 and 150. They are serviceable vessels, and have been adequately maintained. Forty or fifty were reconditioned for use in the neutrality patrol last fall. Am I taking an undue liberty, as a private citizen, if I suggest that it might be possible for the Admiralty to purchase a number of these vessels for convoy service? I see no difference between such a demonstration of "benevolent neutrality" by the administration and the waiving of warplane contracts in the Allies' favor.

With assurances of deep respect and friendship, I am, dear Lord Lothian, Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR D. HOWDEN SMITH.

Mr. NYE. What is the date of that letter?

Mr. DANAHER. The date of that letter is May 2, 1940. The reply is dated May 17, 1940, and reads:

BRITISH EMBASSY,

Washington, D. C., May 17, 1940.

MY DEAR MR. HOWDEN SMITH—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Did Mr. Smith have any authority or any connection with the Navy at that time?

Mr. DANAHER. So far as I know Mr. Smith had no connection with the United States Navy then, nor since. As he himself said, he was writing simply as a private citizen who was deeply interested in the success of the Allied cause.

Mr. WALSH. He apparently had some knowledge about the number of destroyers, and the condition of our Navy.

Mr. DANAHER. I gather, let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts, that he had substantially accurate information not only as to the number of destroyers available, but of the fact that 40 or 50 had been reconditioned for use in the neutrality patrol the previous fall. In any event, the reply follows:

MY DEAR MR. HOWDEN SMITH: Thank you for your kind letter of May 2. I well remember our previous meetings. I would dearly like, if I have the leisure, to read in September

your biography of that wise man, Colonel House.

As to your suggestion about the destroyers, it is an interesting one and I am passing it on to our naval people. But you will no doubt realize that international law forbids a neutral government to sell warships to a belligerent. The American airplanes are, of course, being sold to the French and British Governments by private and not by governmental firms.

Thanking you for your suggestion and with kindest regards.

Yours,

LOTHIAN.

That was addressed to Mr. Arthur D. Howden Smith, 7523 Lexington Avenue, Hollywood, Calif.

After Mr. Howden Smith had permitted me to borrow the correspondence thus recited, and I had the photostats made, Mr. Smith was kind enough to autograph my photostat for me with this memento:

Having long been acquainted with Lord Lothian and being greatly interested in the success of allied arms, I wrote to the British Ambassador a letter dated May 2, 1940, retaining a carbon copy. From the British Embassy came Lord Lothian's reply under date of May 17, 1940, the original of which I still possess. Above is a photostat of the original carbon copy of my letter and the original of Lord Lothian's reply, now presented to Senator John A. Danaher with my best wishes.

ARTHUR D. HOWDEN SMITH.

Mr. President, I thought that some of my colleagues, and particularly the Senator from Massachusetts, in the light of the discussion which developed this afternoon, would be interested in this historical recollection thus prompted by Mr. Smith's correspondence with Lord Lothian.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator has not completed his narrative, has he? Did the letter from the British Embassy end the negotiations for our destroyers while we were neutral?

Mr. DANAHER. It is my recollection that the files of the New York Times and other newspapers will reveal that starting within a week or 10 days thereafter, there were hints of the impending possibility of the United States making such a transfer as that of 50 destroyers to Great Britain, and it is my recollection that during the summer and into the early fall the matter was bruited about here on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere. Ultimately the situation culminated in an opinion written by the Attorney General, in which, as I recall, the Attorney General directed, or at least suggested with mighty cogency, that Admiral Stark certify that the 50 destroyers might be termed "over-age," and therefore be subject to disposal, and thereafter a transfer was effectuated. I think that, roughly, is a sequential summary of events.

Mr. WALSH. If the Senator knows, what was the date when the destroyers were turned over?

Mr. DANAHER. I would say in September of 1940, approximately the 25th or the 26th, but I am speaking from recollection.

Mr. WALSH. How long was it after the British Ambassador said there was no authority under international law for making such a transfer?

Mr. DANAHER. I figure that to be about 4 months.

Mr. WALSH. I should like to state as a matter of record that I personally protested the transfer of our destroyers at the time. It seemed to me at the time to be a real breach of neutrality.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. The conveyance of the destroyers was made by the Executive, was it not, based on an opinion delivered by a very obliging Attorney General? Is that not correct?

Mr. DANAHER. I have no knowledge on that point, I may say to the Senator from New Hampshire. I know that there was a statute on the books in 1917, and it is still there, which forbade the transfer by the United States, while neutral, of warships to any belligerent power.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask that action be taken on the bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the committee will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 8, after the word "passive," it is proposed to strike out "defenses" and insert "defense."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is still open to amendment. If there be no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 1692 was read the third time and passed.

#### SHORTAGE OF NEWSPRINT

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in common with other Members of the Senate, I have been interesting myself in the question of the shortage of newsprint, and have just today received a letter from the editor of the Springfield Daily News, of Springfield, Mass. The letter reads as follows:

DEAR SIR: Concerning your recent letter asking for suggestions as to what might be done to improve the newsprint situation, I am enclosing a small part of one day's batch of Government propaganda that comes in our mail. None of it, as you will see, is worth anything from a newspaper's viewpoint. It is junk, and a shameful waste of paper.

Very truly yours,

THE SPRINGFIELD DAILY NEWS,  
RUSSELL J. COLLINS.

Mr. President, Mr. Collins enclosed in the envelope the batch of publications which I hold in my hand, which represents just 1 day's output from the Government bureaus of things which the newspapers do not use. It may be that much of this material seems important to those who write it, and it may have a great deal of intrinsic value to certain individuals, but the fact of the matter is that the newspaper editors for whom it was issued have not been able to find any use for it.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. This is, in part, what I entered in the RECORD earlier in the week from Oregon editors. In other words, from coast to coast and from Canada to Mexico this material is going out by the millions of copies.

Mr. LODGE. Exactly, and I think it is high time that expenditures of this kind were stopped.

Here is a two-page release about frozen steel. Here is a two-page release about suburbanites who are rushing to buy seeds. Here is another two-page release, and another about how glycerine is recovered from waste fat and made into war material. That is a very important subject but obviously one which the editor did not think worth publishing.

Here is one about P. D. 1-A certificates. Here is another about using fats and greases to make glycerine. Apparently they wanted to be sure that one arrived. Here is one from the United Nations Information Office, which includes information not only for the United Nations but also for the Government of the United States. It is very lengthy, and apparently none of this was used at all, although it is five pages in length, printed on both sides.

Mr. President, I mention these things merely to call attention to the fact that apparently the need for careful expenditure of public funds has not yet reached those whom it should reach, and I desire to express the hope that this concrete illustration of Government waste will result in prompt cooperative action. I do not wish to be a scold; I know that those who are working downtown are patriotic, well-meaning people, and I appeal to their common sense and to their love of country to put their house in order.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator intend to have those publications inserted in the RECORD?

Mr. LODGE. They would take up a great deal of space in the RECORD which I think might be wasted.

Mr. WILLIS. Does the Senator think that if they are of interest to the people of the country they would not be of interest to the Members of Congress?

Mr. LODGE. It would waste much newsprint, I will say to the Senator from Indiana, to print all this material in the RECORD.

Mr. WILLIS. If the newspapers of the country are asked to publish it, should not the Government set an example by putting it into the RECORD? I agree with the Senator, it would be entirely useless to put it into the RECORD, but by the same token I think it is unreasonable to expect the newspapers of the country to expend, out of any of their now greatly depleted private funds, amounts required to publish material which is of no more value to their readers than it is to Members of the Congress.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, in connection with the matter referred to by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, I call the attention of the Senate



to an article from the Times-Herald of this morning, in which it is stated:

The Office of War Information is now preparing a series of publications to "guide" the thinking of the people of this country on international post-war problems, it was disclosed yesterday.

Plans for the next two publications call for an initial run of 350,000 copies apiece. Proposal for a Free World will be released March 28, and The Peace by Which We Fight shortly thereafter, the Office of War Information official said.

If that is anything, it is domestic propaganda, to cover a particular point of view which the Government is attempting to spread among the people. It seems to me that in the first place it is far removed from any policy the Government should be following, and, in the second place, printing these things is a serious waste of paper and manpower, because I very much doubt whether these documents which are sent out, without any demand, without any request, will really be of use, or be read in the manner in which the people read their own newspapers.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 2068, making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2068) making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I should like to take time to make a brief explanation of the appropriation bill. The bill as reported to the Senate is in the sum of \$3,851,176,119. As it passed the House the bill carried \$3,816,206,583. So the amount added by the Senate is only \$34,969,536.

The supplemental appropriations contained in this bill, plus \$449,740,400 of contract authority, are additional to the appropriations and contract authority already granted this year in the amount of \$21,273,000,000, in round figures, making the new total authorized cash and contract authority \$25,573,000,000. Last year the comparable figure was \$24,089,000,000. Therefore what we are appropriating this year corresponds approximately with the amount the Congress appropriated last year.

The supplemental appropriation bill is due to expansions in personnel and training, advance procurement of personnel, the demand for equipment and materials due to the operations of the war, and expansion of the Navy and increases in maintenance and operation.

One of the main reasons for the increase, of course, is the increase in the enlisted strength and number of officers in the Navy. The increase in enlisted strength is 450,000 and the increase in

number of officers is 27,321 over the number heretofore appropriated for.

The appropriation under "Naval Reserves" of \$43,000,000 is primarily for training expenses in connection with aviation cadets, and with the WAVES, and with the college training program, for midshipmen training, and advanced course of aviation training, such as pre-flight, primary, and intermediate.

The funds under the maintenance appropriation of the Bureau of Ships, which are \$737,000,000, are for maintenance requirements, and in part for increased cost of some items, for purchase of material, for the repairs of ships, improvement of the fighting efficiency of vessels of the fleet, and additional commissionings of vessels.

In the case of ordnance and ordnance stores, about one-third of the estimate is for ammunition and equipment for the Marine Corps. The bulk of the remainder is for antiaircraft artillery and machine guns, fire control, and radar equipment, spare breech and barrel mechanism, nets, mines, depth charges, torpedoes, and similar items which are required to carry on the war.

The sums under "Public Works" and "Repair Facilities" are to liquidate existing contract authority. Contract authority has been included in the case of Public Works in the amount of \$239,740,000 for temporary construction in sight before the close of the year, which was authorized in the bill which has just been passed by the Senate, and which has already passed the House.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I observe this is a deficiency appropriation bill for the Navy Department. When does the annual appropriation bill come before the Congress?

Mr. OVERTON. That will come later on in the year.

Mr. McNARY. When was the last appropriation bill passed for the Navy Department?

Mr. OVERTON. I think it was in October of last year.

Mr. McNARY. That was a deficiency bill?

Mr. OVERTON. That was the second supplemental national defense bill.

Mr. McNARY. But it was one which followed the annual appropriation bill which, as I recall, came before the Congress some time last summer?

Mr. OVERTON. There was one Navy Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1943, passed in February 1942, and one passed in October, to which I have just made reference.

Mr. McNARY. I understand that. I want to know how many appropriation bills we have had in the Senate from the time the annual appropriation bill came before the House and the Senate last summer?

Mr. OVERTON. I do not know that I can answer that question. We had the regular appropriation bill. Then we had the second national defense appropriation bill. That is all with the exception

of a few items in some other deficiency bill.

Mr. McNARY. What is the amount of funds now unobligated and unexpended which have heretofore been passed by the House?

Mr. OVERTON. The amount of funds unobligated and unexpended on December 31, 1942, are between \$15,000,000,000 and \$16,000,000,000. By the end of this fiscal year according to the testimony given before the Appropriations Committee we will have a billion and a half unobligated and a cash carry-over of \$14,300,000,000. My recollection is \$15,800,000,000 in round figures, of which \$1,500,000,000 will be unobligated and the remainder will be cash on hand and unexpended.

Mr. McNARY. Then the Senator answers that there is about \$16,000,000,000 now unobligated, which has heretofore been appropriated by the Congress for the use of the Navy Department?

Mr. OVERTON. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. Is that enough of a backlog, or does the Senator desire to add the amount provided in the bill now before the Senate?

Mr. OVERTON. It is necessary to carry a very large unexpended balance in the Navy Department for two reasons. Perhaps both reasons are in reality one. The Congress has in the last 2 or 3 years adopted the policy of withholding contract authorizations from the Navy Department and prefers to make the appropriations in cash. It is necessary to make appropriations in the absence of contract authority far in advance in order to provide for certain matériel and activities of the Navy.

For example, take battleships, which require 3 or 4 years to construct. Appropriations are made and contracts are let. We must do one of two things. We must authorize contracts or appropriate the money. Otherwise the Navy Department could not enter into the contracts. I could perhaps add to the illustrations.

Mr. McNARY. I think the illustration which the Senator gives of the battleship is very inappropriate. It is very unimpressive to me. Why is any sum needed in addition to the \$16,000,000,000 unexpended and unobligated balances allowed to pile up for the Navy? In so doing does not Congress lose all opportunity carefully to watch the expenditures of funds and keep intimately in touch with the activities of the various departments? When we appropriate from time to time vast sums of money and turn them over to be expended, do we not lose control of them and give to some organization the authority to use its discretion in the expenditure of those funds? Has it ever been the practice of Congress, in times of peace or times such as the present, to give vast sums to departments to spend in the future as they please? Do they not usually come to Congress with a budget estimate, and spend the money as it is needed?

Mr. OVERTON. The appropriations are made on break-downs submitted to the Committee on Appropriations, not only in the case of the Navy Department

appropriations but in the case of appropriations for all other departments. At this particular time it is unnecessary for me to remind the able Senator from Oregon that we are in the midst of a great war, and our expenditures must be vastly increased for our Navy, as well as our Army.

Mr. McNARY. I understand.

Mr. OVERTON. The Navy Department must feel that it can enter into various contracts for the construction of ships and for ordnance. It must have inventories on hand in order to be able to equip the fighting men of the Navy at all times and have an abundance. Otherwise the time may come when it has a scarce supply of certain material on hand and cannot obtain the output quickly enough from the manufacturers. Then what is the Navy to do? Shall it wait and go before Congress with a supplemental appropriation bill appropriating the money, then enter into the contracts, and build up the stores which it ought to have in order to conduct this war? That is the reason why we make appropriations of large sums. We do so on estimates which have been submitted to the committee.

Mr. McNARY. If the Senator is satisfied with the explanation, I am not.

Mr. OVERTON. I regret that the Senator is not satisfied.

Mr. McNARY. It seems very strange to me, in view of unobligated and unexpended balances of previous appropriations in the sum of \$16,000,000,000, that we should now be faced with a bill providing for another appropriation called an emergency appropriation. What are we to do with the \$16,000,000,000 in the next 90 days?

Mr. OVERTON. We will not spend it all, of course.

Mr. McNARY. Of course not.

Mr. OVERTON. Indeed we will not.

Mr. McNARY. Why keep adding to this great accretion of funds which the taxpayers some day will have to pay? They are now sighing from the burden which is placed upon them and which they are facing this very moment. I do not understand the philosophy.

Mr. OVERTON. The Senator will recall that when we had the last bill before us, which was the regular and supplemental appropriation, the unexpended and unobligated balance amounted to more than \$21,000,000,000. I then made the same explanation to the Senate in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Yes. It was just as unimpressive that day as it is today. I shall not quarrel with the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. If the Senator could advise members of the Appropriations Committee how they can act otherwise, I think they would be very glad to receive the advice. As a member of the committee I do not know how to handle these bills otherwise, when representatives of the Navy come before us and state that they need these sums. Their requests are supported by Budget estimates, and they state that they must use the funds to construct things which will require many months, or perhaps years,

to construct. They tell us that they need to have on hand tremendous supplies of clothing, munitions, and countless other things in order that they may successfully conduct their end of this war. I do not know how we can say, "We are going to cut down the total cash appropriation in the bill from so much to so much less. Before we make any cash appropriations you must show that you have cut down your unexpended balance from \$15,000,000,000 to \$5,000,000,000, \$3,000,000,000, or \$1,000,000,000."

Mr. McNARY. Under the philosophy of the Senator from Louisiana, he abdicates his position as a member of the committee and falls in line with every suggestion made by a representative of a department. I do not profess to lecture the able Senator, but I assume that a member of a committee should exercise his own judgment with respect to the appropriations which should be made, and not merely say, "We will give you anything you ask for." I think that is a just criticism, not of the able Senator, but of some of the appropriation bills which have come before the Senate. I think we ought to use our judgment. If I were a member of the committee I think that if a man came before me representing the Navy Department and said that the Department had \$16,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money unobligated and unexpended, I would say to him, "I think you had better wait until you reduce that amount to some reasonable sum. Then come back when you need the money and we will give you the money if you can make out a good case."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the Senator from Oregon misunderstood the Senator from Louisiana in what he said.

Mr. McNARY. Possibly my understanding is not so good as that of the able Senator from Arizona. If so, I should like to be corrected.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator said that as of July 1 a billion and a half dollars would be unobligated, not \$16,000,000,000.

Mr. McNARY. I am taking the Senator's statement. I assume that he knows what is in the bill or he would not be here supporting it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I heard the statement, and it is based on the record. I should like to read the record. I read from page 36 of the hearings. Admiral Allen started out by stating that there had already been appropriated \$64,000,000,000 for the Navy when we got into this trouble. As against that, as of the 1st of January, there was obligated a total of \$48,000,000, of which \$18,000,000 was paid for in cash and \$29,000,000 remained unliquidated, leaving an uncommitted balance on January 1 of \$12,282,316,000. Then he said:

Against which we can make contracts the last 6 months of this calendar year, and we estimate we will contract for all of this by June 30, with the exception of \$1,550,524,205.

So we are faced with carrying on with an unobligated balance as of the beginning of the fiscal year of only a billion

and a half instead of \$16,000,000,000 as the Senator first understood.

Mr. OVERTON. However, there was unobligated and unexpended a total of \$16,000,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Which will be contracted for between now and the end of the year. Contracts cannot be made unless there is a prior appropriation by Congress.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, I am in the very embarrassing and awkward position of finding that two distinguished members of the committee are unable to agree on the ratio 16 to 1. [Laughter.]

Mr. HAYDEN. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. McNARY. I am assuming that the able Senator, whom I know to be able—I have served with him a great many years—says that \$16,000,000,000—he says it three times—is unobligated and uncommitted.

Mr. OVERTON. Unexpended.

Mr. McNARY. Very well, unexpended.

Mr. HAYDEN. And between now and the end of the year the contracts are to be let.

Mr. McNARY. I ask the pardon of the Senator from Arizona, who always enters the Treasury of the United States with a key and with a smile. [Laughter.] Every one—there is no use in being personal in the matter—wants to have appropriated enough money to enable the Nation to carry on; but there seems to be a desire on the part of some members of the committee to report favorably as to every sum which is asked for by everyone who comes before the committee. I think that one of the most appalling things to the people of the country is the burden that is being placed on their backs; and for one—and I have said this a great many times when appropriation bills have been before the Senate—I think we should shave the appropriations carefully and should use our own independent judgment, as men of character, judgment, and position, as to the amount of money that should be expended.

Mr. President, when \$16,000,000,000 is mentioned, I remember that I was told when I was somewhat younger than I am now that the human mind cannot appreciate what a billion dollars is. Now we are told that the Treasury says that \$16,000,000,000 is lying in its vaults, for the use of the Navy Department. Then I ask, Why bring in the bill and call it a deficiency bill? That is my position.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, let me interrupt the Senator. I have looked at the record—

Mr. McNARY. I assumed that the Senator was familiar with the record.

Mr. OVERTON. I find that on page 7 of the House hearings a break-down is given. I think that the figures which I shall now present to the Senate are in line with what I stated from recollection a few minutes ago. The figures are under the caption, "Summary of appropriations, authorizations, obligations, commitments, and expenditures for war, for appropriations and authorizations to December 31, 1942—July 1, 1940, through December 31, 1942, actual, with certain estimates through June 30, 1943." The



figures show that the estimated unobligated balance as of July 1, 1943, will be \$1,550,600,000. The estimated unexpended balances of appropriations and corporation commitments as of July 1, 1943, will be \$14,331,900,000.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the Senator originally made his statement from data from which he had fixed in his mind. He read the report of the Senate committee, and now he has read from the House committee.

Mr. OVERTON. I am not reading from the House committee; I am reading from the House committee hearings.

Mr. McNARY. Yes. What is the amount?

Mr. OVERTON. I say that from \$15,000,000,000 to \$16,000,000,000 will be unexpended at the end of the fiscal year 1943.

Mr. McNARY. I made such a statement a moment ago, and I found disagreement with the able Senator from Arizona, who is a good fiscal Senator, and who looks with very great kindness upon appropriation bills.

The Senator's statement is that \$15,800,000,000 will be unexpended and unobligated, but still the Senator wants the bill passed; is that correct?

Mr. OVERTON. The committee authorized me to report it.

Mr. McNARY. Yes.

Mr. OVERTON. Of course, any Senator who wishes to oppose it may oppose it. I undertook to make an explanation in answer to the questions which had been propounded.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate the very great kindness on the part of the Senator.

Mr. OVERTON. When it comes to figures, I may not always be absolutely accurate.

Mr. McNARY. I have given my statement from the point of view of one who wants to keep at as low a level as possible the amount of money which the taxpayers will be obligated to pay, consistent with the successful and vigorous prosecution of the war, and with the huge sum now available, which is almost beyond the conception of mortal mind, I do not see why Senators want to add to it money carried by the appropriation bill.

Mr. OVERTON. That is the report of the committee, and its recommendation.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. OVERTON. I yield.

Mr. DAVIS. On page 6 of the bill, under the title "Coast Guard," in line 19, appears the following item:

Pay and allowances, Coast Guard, \$10,600,000.

We are told that a part of that sum is to be spent for quarters for officers, and a part is to be spent for pay. I wonder why, under the heading "Pay and allowances," we could not have the amount for pay stated separately from the amount for allowances—the two amounts which make up the total of \$10,600,000?

Mr. OVERTON. We had no testimony before the Senate committee in respect to that particular item.

Mr. DAVIS. Does not the Senator think it would be wise—I simply make the suggestion—for the committee itself

to ask for particulars, and to divide those two accounts?

Mr. OVERTON. I suppose that could be done. What particular reason does the Senator assign for doing that?

Mr. DAVIS. Then we would know how much would be appropriated for pay and how much for allowances. As it is now, they are lumped together in an appropriation of \$10,600,000.

Mr. OVERTON. I suppose that information would be given in the breakdown.

Mr. DAVIS. I think the pay and allowances could be separated.

Mr. ELLENDER. The allowances are fixed under the law; are they not?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; but we ought to know what they are.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not know what advantage that would be.

Mr. OVERTON. I thought that possibly there was a break-down as to that; but I find there is no break-down as to how much is for pay and how much for allowances.

Mr. McNARY. Question.

Mr. OVERTON. But the allowances are fixed by law.

Mr. DAVIS. I understand that; but we should be told what the allowances are, as well as what the pay is. The pay, too, is fixed by law.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate proceed to consider the amendments of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Naval Establishment—Office of the Secretary, miscellaneous expenses," on page 2, line 12, after the figures "\$6,723, 117", to strike out the colon and the following: "Provided, That no appropriation for the Navy Department or naval service available during the fiscal year 1943 (except funds transferred or made available to other executive agencies for use for naval purposes) shall be used after March 31, 1943, for the employment of persons for the performance of service in other than the Navy Department or elsewhere than under the Navy Department, except employees who had been employed by and performing service under the Navy Department for 3 months or more immediately prior to their detail for service elsewhere."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Naval Personnel," on page 3, line 20, to increase the appropriation for Naval Reserve from \$40,800,000 to \$48,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, at the end of line 2, to increase the appropriation for maintenance, Bureau of Ships, from \$737,230,464 to \$765,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Yards and Docks," on page 4, line 23, after the word "including," to insert "not to exceed \$5,000 for the."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Increase and replacement of naval vessels—Repair facilities, Navy", on page 6, line 2, after the figures "\$10,000,000", to insert a comma and "toward contract authorization heretofore granted, to remain available until expended, and in addition the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for repair facilities in the amount of not to exceed \$210,000,000, as authorized by the act of February 19, 1943, Public Law 1."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 7, to strike out:

CONSTRUCTION OF FLOATING DRYDOCKS, NAVY  
The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to enter into contracts in the amount of not to exceed \$210,000,000 for the construction of mobile floating drydocks and collateral facilities and incidental work, as authorized by the act approved February 19, 1943 (Public Law 1).

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the amendments of the committee.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments which I have been authorized by the committee to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana on behalf of the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 21, after the word "elsewhere" and before the period it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That the first proviso under the heading of "Miscellaneous expenses" in title I of the Naval Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1943 (Public Law 441, approved February 7, 1942) is hereby repealed.

Mr. McNARY. What is the reason for that amendment?

Mr. OVERTON. There is a limitation of \$5,000 on the amount the Navy can spend in the employment of any civilian personnel. The Navy Department is the only department or agency of the Government which works under such a limitation, and it finds it difficult to operate under it. It has to employ personnel whose services are at times worth much more than \$5,000. The War Department does not have the limitation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the second amendment offered by the Senator from Louisiana on behalf of the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 14, after the figures "\$494,968,000", it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That so much of the Naval Appropriation Act, 1943 (Public Law 411, 77th Cong.), under the heading "Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel" as reads "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be available for the pay of any midshipman appointed from enlisted men of the Navy who has not served aboard a vessel of the Navy in full commission or performed equivalent service with fleet aircraft

for at least 9 months prior to admission to the Naval Academy," is amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That during the present emergency qualified enlisted men of the Navy, Naval Reserve, and Marine Corps may be appointed to the Naval Academy after such periods and under such conditions of service as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy."

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, under existing law enlisted men of the Navy must serve 9 months on a full commissioned ship before they can make application for appointment to the Naval Academy under designation by the President or by the Secretary of the Navy. On the other hand, there is no requirement that Naval Reserves shall serve on board any ship or for any length of time, although the regulations provide, I think, that they should be in service for 9 months before they are appointed.

There are many seamen who are at sea and doing sea duty who are not on full commissioned ships, and there are a number of them who are also doing shore duty. The purpose of the amendment is to put the Naval Reserves and the regularly enlisted seamen on the same basis for selection as appointees to the Naval Academy by the President or by the Secretary of the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 2068) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. OVERTON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKellar, Mr. Glass, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Overton, Mr. Nye, and Mr. Lodge conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Taylor, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

S. 303. An act to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States;

H. R. 1975. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2023. An act to amend section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year level premium term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside the continental limits of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2030. An act to permit the shipment tax-free of certain tobacco products to Territories of the United States for the use of members of the military and naval forces of the United States.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce, reported favorably the nomination of Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, United States Navy, retired, to be a member of the United States Maritime Commission for the term of 6 years from April 16, 1943 (reappointment).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

#### WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the nominations in the War Manpower Commission be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

#### THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

#### RECESS TO FRIDAY

Mr. HAYDEN. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Friday, March 19, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 17 (legislative day of March 9), 1943:

#### WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION APPOINTMENTS

Dr. Frank H. Sparks to be Director, Bureau of Manpower Utilization, at \$8,000 per annum, Washington office.

Lawrence B. Fenneman, to be area director, at \$6,500 per annum, Maryland area office.

Farrell Daniel Coyle, to be area director, at \$6,500 per annum, Providence area office.

Frederick R. Whitney, to be head manpower utilization consultant, at \$6,500 per annum, Boston regional office.

Frank M. Bristow, to be field supervisor, at \$5,600 per annum, Kansas City regional office.

Ramy B. Deschner, to be area director, at \$5,600 per annum, District of Columbia area office.

William J. Fitzgerald, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, New London area office.

Elmer K. Delp, to be senior training specialist, at \$4,600 per annum, New York regional office.

#### IN THE ARMY

##### APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be chaplains, with rank of first lieutenant, to rank from date of appointment

Charles Edwin Brown, Jr.

John Porter Fellows

James Clarke Griffin

John Henry Hingson

John Michael Hughes

Richard William Jungfer, Jr.

Alfred Charles Longley

Arthur Carl Piepkorn

Harold Owen Prudell

To be first lieutenant, Medical Corps, with rank from date of appointment

Charles Herman Ransom

#### POSTMASTERS

##### ALABAMA

Joseph G. Hardin, Hillsboro.

##### CALIFORNIA

Janet R. Carroll, Pebble Beach.

Albert C. Rist, Bradley.

##### ILLINOIS

Webster Hanna, Noble.

##### COLORADO

Ethel A. Pfost, Arapahoe.

Flora G. Hier, Castle Rock.

Loudene Humeston, Collbran.

Velma M. McNair, Kirk.

Marie E. Greenwood, Stratton.

George S. Niebuhr, Walsenburg.

##### CONNECTICUT

Albert F. Ricci, Stafford Springs.

##### IOWA

Hans E. Eiel, Buffalo Center.

Mary E. Coons, Carson.

Orange J. DeVault, Earlham.

Albert B. Mahnke, Greene.

Martha E. Radford, Hancock.

Rita A. Thomas, Keswick.

Michael R. Griebel, Lone Tree.

Rollin J. Gilchrist, Marengo.

Gertrude C. Ward, Melrose.

Pearle M. Nelson, Modale.

Rose A. Stalder, Nodaway.

Joe H. Kout, Ocheyedan.

Carroll O. Lightfoot, Onslow.

James M. Hiri, Princeton.

Clayton P. Norris, Red Oak.

Orlow L. Goodrich, Scranton.

Gladys G. Ayers, Shannon City.

##### KENTUCKY

Carolyn V. Ducker, Butler.

##### LOUISIANA

Joy Pate, Hornbeck.

Clinton C. Barron, Lillie.

Henry J. Smith, Mandeville.

Esther J. Mohr, Pearl River.

Susie L. Ristom, Starks.

Leland J. DeVany, Vinton.

Thelma M. Fleming, Westlake.

##### MAINE

M. Louise Miller, Waldoboro.

Alton B. Gerrish, Winter Harbor.



## MARYLAND

Mary Estelle Ennis, Joppa.

## MASSACHUSETTS

William Bacon, North Oxford.  
William B. Barnes, Petersham.

## NEW JERSEY

Bradford D. Coffey, Bayville.  
Michael A. Nigro, Berkeley Heights.  
S. Herminah Smith, Brigantine.  
Grace V. Willard, Crosswicks.  
Elizabeth Massey, Franklin.  
Edward M. McIntyre, Gibbsboro.  
Louis C. Parker, Gloucester City.  
John B. Braun, Jr., Hightstown.  
Georgia A. Barth, Landisville.  
Edward J. Wagner, Marlton.  
Annie Lester, Monmouth Junction.  
Jeremiah B. Beaton, Mount Ephraim.  
Salvatore Verde, Northvale.  
Xavier H. Walter, Palmyra.  
Mervil E. Haas, Riverton.  
Smith Kennedy, Roseland.  
Edward J. Lennon, Stone Harbor.  
Ethel B. Carr, Stratford.  
Lebbeus Potter, Sussex.  
Anthony J. Savarese, Woodcliff Lake.

## OKLAHOMA

Lloyd Barclay, Tryon.

## SOUTH DAKOTA

John H. Evans, Agar.  
Anna A. Dithmer, Kadoka.  
Charles E. Stutenroth, Redfield.  
Mary L. Gaynor, Springfield.  
B. Maynard Christenson, Volin.  
Gertrude M. Matteson, White Rock.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 17, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, whose property is to have mercy and forgive sins, we pray that we may not walk in the flesh of this world. Deliver us from the deadening ministries which thrive in the realm of evil and destroy the finer faculties of the soul. Today we bow in grateful memory of Him whose life and character have lived through the years and become the inspiration to do the work of the good Samaritan in the spirit of our Master and Lord.

In the performance of our duties may we not hesitate nor consult even prudence. We pray that everything in us may generously and heroically respond to the momentous call of these times. We believe that our Republic is a providence which is shaping its fortunes and sealing its destiny. We would hallow it as our home and shrine and beseech Thee that its vision and dream of freedom may be realized in the health of all nations. Graciously remember our President, our Speaker, and the Congress. Arm them with skill, knowledge, and power. O cleanse our America, the temple of liberty; purge Thou its arteries of the poison of all selfishness and from those whose pressing feet have never apprehended the sacredness of our soil nor felt its vibrant notes ringing in their breasts. In the name of the world's Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2023. An act to amend section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year level premium term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside the continental limits of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2030. An act to permit the shipment tax-free of certain tobacco products to territories of the United States for the use of members of the military and naval forces of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 303. An act to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1975) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes."

## BOARD OF VISITORS OF THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

MARCH 15, 1943.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker, House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of the act approved May 17, 1928 (U. S. C., title 10, sec. 1052a), I have designated Hon. J. BUELL SNYDER, Hon. JOE STARNES, Hon. JOHN H. KERR, Hon. D. LANE POWERS, and Hon. ALBERT J. ENGEL, members of the Committee on Appropriations, as members from this committee to the Board of Visitors of the United States Military Academy for the calendar year 1943.

With assurances of my regard, I am,  
Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE CANNON,  
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

## IRISH SALUTATIONS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, may I on this glorious morning, March 17, salute you as a true descendant of St. Patrick with a "Top o' the morning, a Cajamathu, and an Erin go brath"—begorra.

It is not necessary for me to tell you that I am joined in these salutations by every Member of this House of Irish extraction. It is true and as proven from generation to generation there is no nationality in the world that owes so much

to this country as the fighting Irish owe to the land of their adoption, the United States of America.

Every honest, sincere, loyal, patriotic American of Irish extraction not only on this St. Patrick's Day but on every day falls to his knees and thanks God for the opportunities he has been given. Every red-blooded, two-fisted, square-shooting, hard-hitting Irishman is willing to give his last drop of blood in defense of the ideals, traditions, precepts, policies, and free institutions that have made life so dear to him in America. Absolute proof of this statement is borne out by the Sullivan boys of Iowa and many other Irish-Americans who have made the supreme sacrifice in this war and other wars that our form of government may continue.

In greeting you this morning, you are acutely conscious of the undisputed fact that the O'Briens were the noblest of all Kings of Ireland, and on the left side of the House we have the O'Haras, the Welches, the Gavins, the Kearneys, and the Culkins, brave men all lieutenants in the great army of King O'Brien.

On the right side of the House, we greet those three well-known Irishmen from Texas, brave Milton Michael O'West, Spanish-speaking Richard the Lion-hearted O'Kleberg, and the famous fighting O'Kilday.

The Irish, as you know, are a generous race. Therefore, we salute the numerous sons of old Erin—on the majority side of the aisle such as—the Merritts, the Lynches, the Gavagans, the Cullens, the Curleys, the Fitzpatricks, the O'Tooles, the O'Learys, and the O'Connors, and being most generous we will mention the Keoghs, the Fays, the Kennedys, the Harts, the Nortons, and the Flannagans. We will not overlook the Cochrans, the Fogartys, the Maddens, the Kirwans, the Murphys, the O'Neals, the Kellys, the Delaneys. Yes, the McGranerys and the Bradleys, and we pay particular attention to that stalwart Sullivan of Nevada, who is the honorary chairman of the Five Sullivan Brothers Foundation.

Yes, last but not least, that great counterfeit Irishman, my distinguished friend, PAT CANNON, of Florida.

We have not purposely left out the O'Briens of Chicago and the O'Briens of Detroit, but please remember they are merely O'Briens and in no way associated either conspicuously or remotely with The O'Briens. We were the kings of Ireland.

There was a time when the McCormacks tried to assert themselves as leaders in good old Erin. These bog-trotting, shillelagh-flinging, banshee-howling McCormacks shouted from the housetops that they owned the Lakes of Killarney. The truth of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is these McCormacks now known as Boston Irish, did receive privileges from the O'Briens to use these beautiful Lakes of Killarney, and were told very definitely and emphatically by one of my ancestors that they could bathe and wash their clothes in these lakes. The astounding and sensational part of this confidential information to you Members of the House is that at no

time were they ever accused of abusing these privileges.

It has been our extreme pleasure to name three distinguished gentlemen each year who have made great contributions to the Irish cause—and in 1943 and so not to keep you in suspense any longer, we will present these names. They are as follows: TOMMY D'ALESSANDRO, LOUIS CAPOZZOLI, and VITO MARCANTONIO, and inasmuch as these gentlemen have been given this unique and rare distinction, I hope that when I meet them tomorrow I can say with all sincerity "Americano fratello avuto abbuono diverte mento la fiesta Saint Patrick."

Again, Top o' the morning, God bless you, Mr. Speaker, and God bless you all.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. BURDICK and Mr. CELLER asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a magazine article and a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement by Dr. Emily Dunning Barringer and Judge Dorothy Kenyon, at a cost of \$157.50.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House in the RECORD and include therein a petition from the farmers of Berks County, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### EXEMPTING MERCHANT SEAMEN SERVING IN WAR ZONES FROM CERTAIN TAXES

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CAPOZZOLI addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two particulars, in one to include a newspaper clipping, and in the other to include some letters.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

#### INFLATION CONTROL

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, if John L. Lewis carries out his proposed strike of the bituminous coal miners, he will become the Benedict Arnold of 1943.

Higher and ever higher industrial wages and profits have from the beginning led the inflation parade. Mr. Lewis now threatens to blow the lid completely from all semblance of inflation control. He has been encouraged in this course by easy victories over various War Labor Boards. If he again has his way, he will initiate another cycle of rising prices.

Without reference to our fighting men, there are millions of unorganized people in this country who are suffering far more war deprivations than are Mr. Lewis' miners. All civilians should take pride in these small sacrifices—many do. But while the many sacrifice, the few carry on a mad and shameful struggle for war profits. We are sick because of the constant attacks on the home front by economic pirates of the John L. Lewis type. Furthermore, there is a limit to the shocks which even American economy can withstand.

Gentlemen, I hope the President will take a firm hand in this civil strife. It is high time this Government stand its ground on the home front.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, as I walked into this Chamber this morning I heard a burst of applause greet the Speaker of this House. It was merited both on his account and because of the shamrock which adorned the lapel of his coat.

This is St. Patrick's Day. And it is fit and proper we pay tribute to those of our citizens in whose veins courses the blood of the Irish race. They have made a notable contribution to the freedom, the culture, and the spiritual life of this Republic. Wherever there has been a cause that needed assistance or a wrong that needed resistance, the Irish, their sons and daughters have been in the forefront of the fight. In the building

of this Nation, from Andrew Jackson down to this good day the sons and daughters of Ireland have written their names high on our country's scroll of fame.

#### COAL PRODUCTION

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if the threat of John L. Lewis to call a strike in the soft coal mines of this country early in April becomes a reality, that strike will be equivalent to a major disaster suffered by our armed fighting forces. It is futile to talk of carrying the "four freedoms" throughout the world and establishing a world supergovernment when we cannot here at home guarantee coal to the industries engaged in the production of munitions of war.

May I have the attention of a leader or two on the majority side? I see here the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] and other majority leaders. I charge here and now that this administration and the majority party lack either the courage or the inclination to deal with this threat of strike by John L. Lewis either by action or legislation. I hope you will prove that I do not know what I am talking about.

#### DRIED FRUITS

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, unless something is done to revise the rationing program for dried fruits in the next few days, thousands of tons of dried fruits are going to spoil. I have just received a letter this morning from Eugene V. Talkington, of the W. A. Barber Grocery Co., of Madison, Ind., in which he says:

We have approximately \$5,000 of dried fruits which will spoil unless we can move it within the next 6 weeks. It will have to be point-free to do this as the consumer will not buy dried fruits in any quantity unless it is point-free.

Mr. Speaker, that is not a lot of dried fruits, but I checked with the Department of Agriculture, and the Office of Price Administration, and I find it is not an unusual case. Twenty points were required at first to buy dried fruits. That now has been reduced to 12 points, and still dried fruits are not moving. If something is not done, we are going to lose thousands of tons of dried fruits while we are rationing these same commodities.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include four petitions and memorials to



Congress from the General Court of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

#### CEILING PRICES ON LIVESTOCK

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I want to protest with all my strength the proposal of O. P. A. to put ceiling prices on livestock. I call upon that agency to halt this latest plan, hatched among its so-called experts here in Washington, before it deals another lethal blow to the food-production industry of this country. Is not this year's food supply in enough danger without adding another threat? This latest proposal will do nothing but to bring chaos to the livestock industry of this country and will not produce more meat for the consumer.

Let me give you, in brief, the effect such action would have.

In the first place, it will require the appointment of another vast army of appraisers whose decisions will have to be guided by a voluminous set of regulations and amendments prepared by the "experts" in Washington. The only men competent to judge livestock on the hoof are the men employed by the packers as buyers, and at high wages. This new army of appraisers will be composed of these experienced men transferred to the Government pay roll at higher wages or it will be composed of men incompetent to do the job properly. It is most likely to be the latter. We have seen the mushroom growth of O. P. A. in the past year. Do we want another expansion of the same kind, in view of the already serious shortage of manpower? The answer is emphatically "No."

If inexperienced appraisers set the grade too high the packer will not buy the animals. In that event, is the Government prepared to force him to do so? If they set the price too low the producer will be the loser and the packer will reap the advantage. Do you think the livestock raisers will go on fattening cattle for market under these circumstances? No; they will sell their matured stock and keep their young stock on grass. I need not point out to you the effect this would have on the supply of meat.

If the present ceiling prices cannot be enforced on packers and retailers how can a ceiling be enforced on the producers of livestock?

Let me again state that the O. P. A.'s proposal to place ceiling prices on livestock will wreck the livestock industry and will not produce more meat for the consumers at whatever price he has to pay.

#### LOSS OF LONG-FIBER COTTON IN ARIZONA

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, because of the fact that almost all of the time in debate yesterday on House Joint Resolution 96 was, according to our practice, taken up by members of the Appropriations Committee, I fear that I will not have time to say what I should say except in this way, briefly.

I think there is no question that the Farm Security Administration is doing a great work in the function for which it was created, and I want to further that work in every way that I can. However, when it took over the matter of handling migratory labor and getting foreign labor for various sections of the country, it fell down on the job. I have not time to discuss the reasons. It fell down very seriously on the job in my State.

Down there in the sunny valleys of Arizona we grow long-fiber cotton. Such cotton is an inch and a half or more in length. That cotton is of vital importance in war industry, for parachutes, balloons, and in other respects. Our farmers were asked to grow it. Now thousands of bales of that cotton in Arizona have been wasted and lost this season because of the failure to get labor to pick it. At least 7,000 bales remain now unpicked, and at least 10,000 bales have been wasted because picked too late. I want to put this matter of procuring labor in the hands of somebody who can do the work, get the production, and not cost our farmers millions of dollars.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arizona has expired.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include a speech made by Samuel C. Hatton.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

#### TRIBUTE TO FRANK L. YATES

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and include certain brief newspaper comments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

[Mr. RANDOLPH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made yesterday and include certain letters and excerpts, and in another particular to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include a report upon the Farm Security Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

#### AMENDING THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 677) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 603 (a) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is

hereby amended by (1) striking out "\$800,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,200,000,000", and (2) striking out of the third proviso "July 1, 1943" in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1944."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and ask the gentleman to explain the parliamentary procedure and also the bill.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, the Senate passed a bill extending the authorization of title VI of the Federal Housing Act for a period of 3 years, and increasing the authorization for insurance from \$800,000,000 to \$1,200,000,000. The House bill has that identical provision, and a further provision which would extend title I of the Federal Housing Act for a period of 3 years from the end of the present fiscal year.

The parliamentary situation is such that we desire to consider the Senate bill and strike out all after the enacting clause and substitute the language of the House bill, so that the bill may go to conference with respect to the extension of title I. There will also be offered an amendment to the provision of the House bill which extends title I. That amendment, so as to extend title I for only 1 year, I am sure will be accepted. I will accept it and I am sure there will be no objection. The measure is here with a unanimous report from the Committee on Banking and Currency and a rule has been reported by the Rules Committee for its consideration.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Further reserving the right to object, may I observe, to clarify a misunderstanding with respect to the F. H. A., the F. H. A. only insures loans made by qualified lending institutions, banks, insurance companies, building and loan associations, and so forth. This is merely to authorize an increase in their insurance facilities. Is that correct?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Title VI simply has to do with the construction of houses in war areas and must be distinguished from title II in that respect.

Mr. STEAGALL. That is to be clearly understood. The purpose of the legislation as embodied in the extension of the authorization under title VI is to permit the insurance of residential construction in defense areas, construction that it is calculated will be permanent, or construction distinguished from that which would be taken care of under the Lanham Act, by direct appropriation out of the Treasury. Under title VI of the Federal Housing Act this work would be done purely by private investment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understand the gentleman will move to strike out all after the enacting clause of this bill and substitute H. R. 1914?

Mr. STEAGALL. I am going to ask unanimous consent that the language of the House bill be considered as a substitute for the Senate bill, and then an amendment will be offered as to title I.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Section 2 extends title I from 1943 to 1946. I understand

the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] has an amendment to reduce that.

Mr. STEAGALL. The gentleman is quite correct, and the amendment is entirely acceptable. It conforms to the provision of section 1 of the bill, which extends the authority of title VI for 1 year so that they will conform, and the authorization in each instance be continued only for 1 year.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it the intention of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] to substitute for the Senate bill the House bill on which a rule has been granted a few days ago?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct.

Mr. SABATH. May I ask what is the amendment that has been agreed upon to the House bill?

Mr. STEAGALL. The amendment which will be offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] simply changes the provision of section 2 of the House bill, so that the authorization for continued activities under title I of the Federal Housing Act will be limited to the period from July 1, 1943, to July 1, 1944, instead of the provision for extension for 3 years, which conforms to the extension as to title VI of the Federal Housing Act. It makes each of those extensions for a period of only 1 year.

Mr. SABATH. And that is the only amendment that is proposed?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct.

Mr. SABATH. The House bill on which a rule has been granted will be substituted for the Senate bill with this amendment which the gentleman has explained?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct.

Mr. SABATH. Then I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the language of the House bill following the enacting clause be substituted for the language of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STEAGALL: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That section 603 (a) of such act, as amended, is hereby amended by (1) striking out '\$800,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '\$1,200,000,000'; and (2) striking out of the third proviso 'July 1, 1943' in each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1944.'"

"Sec. 2. The first sentence of section 2 (a) of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out '1943' and inserting in lieu thereof '1946.'"

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEAN: In line 10, strike out "1946" and insert "1944."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection, and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have some information on this measure. What is the present parliamentary situation?

The SPEAKER. The parliamentary situation is that unanimous consent was granted to take up the Senate bill. The gentleman from Alabama has moved to strike out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and substitute the language of a House bill. To that amendment the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN] has offered an amendment changing the date, and that amendment to the amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Have any figures been changed since the bill left the committee?

Mr. STEAGALL. None whatever except that in extending authority under title I we extend it 1 year instead of 3 years. That makes it conform to the provision which extends title VI for a period of 1 year.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What was the amount in the original bill?

Mr. STEAGALL. It was originally \$100,000,000. We have extended the authorization until it has reached \$800,000,000, and that is now exhausted. The authorization would permit insurance of loans up to \$1,200,000,000, which it is thought will complete the job of insurance of residential property in defense areas.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. One billion two hundred million dollars is what we agreed upon in the committee?

Mr. STEAGALL. That is correct. There is no change in the House bill except that we limit the authorization in title I to a period of 1 year instead of 3 years.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What was the purpose of making it 1946, instead of 1944?

Mr. STEAGALL. There was no particular reason. We are going to make it 1944, instead of 1946.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman from Ohio yield to me for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Was the increase from \$800,000,000 to \$1,200,000,000 based on the idea it was a 3-year extension and not a 1-year extension, and do you need such money as that for a 1-year extension?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I cannot answer that question. What the basis was I cannot say.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I might observe that there is no affiliation at all between the increase of the available insurance under title VI from \$800,000,000 to

\$1,200,000,000. The date in section 2 has to do with the extension of title I which is an organization matter and the amount of the insurance here has to do with title VI which is the title: Housing Insurance.

Mr. STEAGALL. The fact that we add \$400,000,000 is expected to take care of all existing demands for insurance of this kind.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, H. R. 1914 will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

#### COST OF LIVING

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following resolution (H. Res. 172, Rept. No. 253), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

*Resolved*, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1698) to amend the act entitled "An act to aid in stabilizing the cost of living" (Public Law No. 729, 77th Cong.). That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 27]

Allen, Ill.	Feighan	Lewis, Colo.
Barry	Fenton	Luce
Buckley	Fish	Lynch
Cannon, Fla.	Gale	McGranery
Carson, Ohio	Gallagher	McGregor
Case	Gibson	Mahon
Clason	Goodwin	Mansfield,
Cochran	Guyer	Mont.
Cole, N. Y.	Hagen	Martin, Iowa
Colmer	Harless, Ariz.	May
Crawford	Harness, Ind.	Miller, Conn.
Culkin	Hart	Miller, Mo.
Davis	Hinshaw	Murphy
Dawson	Jarman	Myers
Dingell	Kee	Newsome
Durham	Kennedy	O'Toole
Engel	Kerr	Outland
Englebright	Kilday	Pfeifer
Fay	King	Philbin



Reece, Tenn.	Sheridan	Thomas, N. J.
Rogers, Calif.	Short	Treadway
Sabbath	Snyder	Weiss
Satterfield	Sparkman	Whelchel, Ga.
Scanlon	Starnes, Ala.	Winter
Scott	Taylor	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). On this roll call 361 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. McCORMACK, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. BOREN asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article appearing in the March 15 issue of the Daily New Era, of Lancaster, Pa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KINZER]? There was no objection.

#### FARM LABOR PROGRAM, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 96, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 96, with Mr. SIKES in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, summarizing the parliamentary situation, there is pending a substitute for the resolution offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], and a perfecting amendment to the resolution itself offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. I wonder if we can arrive at some agreement as to time for debate in which we can expect to pass on the amendment?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman mean the Tarver amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All pending amendments and those read for information at the desk. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto close in 150 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved, 5 minutes for the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and 5 minutes for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 150 minutes, the last 10 minutes to be reserved, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and one-half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say, Mr. Chairman, that is 15 minutes more than the total of all applications that have been made up to this time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know what would happen to amendments to the original resolution—other amendments than the Tarver amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They may be offered at the close of the time fixed for debate.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would that include any other amendments that might be offered to this bill? I have one or two amendments I propose to offer.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. How much additional time would the gentleman require?

Mr. FULMER. I would like to have at least 10 minutes on my amendments.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Then, Mr. Chairman, in order to comply with the request of the gentleman from South Carolina, I ask that the time for debate be increased to 160 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 160 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask the chairman, assuming the time to be equally divided among those who are standing, how much time will each Member have?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The 160 minutes is 15 minutes more than a total of 5 minutes for each Member.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Tarver amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there was considerable discussion on the floor yesterday to the effect that while all of us recognized and do recognize the serious and acute situation with reference to the shortage of farm labor, no one has done much of anything about it except talk. Largely that may be true, but I may say for the benefit of some of those that have been so vociferous in their remarks on that subject that this matter has had the very careful and considerate attention and a lot of work by your Committee on Agriculture.

Our chairman, realizing the serious situation and growing exodus from the farms of farm labor as well as farm operators, more than a year ago called Secretary Wickard, General Hershey, and others having to do with the manpower of this country, before our committee, and we spent days and weeks trying at that time to convince those in au-

thority that the situation was progressively becoming more serious and that we were very likely to face, and face soon, the problem now confronting us. I may say with some modesty that last October, and even before that time, I personally called the attention of this House to this matter and set out in a letter to General Hershey a resolution which I believed would be beneficial in the way of stopping the exodus of manpower from the farms. If you will look at the RECORD of October 12, 1942, you will find the eight-point program I submitted at that time containing many of the suggestions that are contained in the Bankhead bill pending in the Senate.

I shall support the Tarver amendment, because I am convinced that \$12,100,000, the amount suggested by the gentleman from Georgia, will do the work just as effectively as the amount provided for in the bill. You are not going to get much help, scarcely any help at all for States such as my State, Kansas, Nebraska, Iowa, Indiana, and most of the other farm States, except such as you have in those States right now. The only thing you can do, so far as seasonal crops is concerned, will be to shift some labor from one part of a State to another. You are not going to be able to take that labor within those States to other sections of the country to any great extent. The labor that would be of any value is just not there, and there is no sense in using money to buggyrise a few back and forth over the country.

California and some of the other border States face a more serious situation. The testimony before our committee recently was that about six millions would be largely sufficient to take care of the matter of getting Mexican labor into those sections of the country. That will leave \$6,000,000 plus for these other States I have mentioned and other sections of the country for recruiting and transporting seasonal labor. I have a high regard for the opinion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and others on the Appropriations Committee. However, I say to you in all seriousness that you are not going to get much at best, because the exodus from the farms into the defense plants and into the Army has already taken practically all of the available labor.

I am in accord with the suggestion of the committee that this be handled by the Extension Service, because, as the gentleman from Arizona and others have said, it has been demonstrated that the Farm Security Administration have already displayed their inability to do this work.

I say to this House that I think as do other members of my committee who have given much time to the investigation of this problem, that \$12,000,000 will do the job just as well as \$26,000,000.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Do I understand the gentleman to say that \$6,000,000 will take care of any importation of foreign

labor that we might need? Was that the testimony from all the States on the border? I am very doubtful that \$6,000,000 will do this part.

Mr. RIZLEY. I feel sure that it would quite adequately take care of it. That was the conclusion I reached from the testimony before our committee.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. GILCHRIST. The gentleman is a member of the committee on which I, too, have the honor to serve. This committee has considered this matter but they have never been able to jar loose anything, have they?

Mr. RIZLEY. I will say to my friend from Iowa that I regret to say we did not seem to be able to get those in high places very much concerned, until almost too late.

Mr. GILCHRIST. They have obtained promises, but they have not been fulfilled.

Mr. RIZLEY. I agree with the gentleman from Iowa.

General Hershey said, and Mr. McNutt said, and everyone else who came before our committee who had any connection with the manpower situation said they were going to do something about it, but that was about as far as it went; nothing was done; only now they are beginning to awaken to the extreme seriousness of the situation that some of us were greatly concerned about a year ago when we first started these hearings.

Mr. Chairman, we have a very definite commitment to the people of this country to cut and cut to the quick every appropriation where possible to do so. I think we can save \$12,000,000 by the adoption of the Tarver amendment without injury to the purposes of the bill. I sincerely hope a majority of the Committee will vote accordingly.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

The CHAIRMAN recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] for 5 minutes.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent before I take my 5 minutes that my amendment may be read for the information of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to be offered by Mr. PACE: Page 4, line 7, after the colon following the word "service", insert "Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county, or for the transportation of any worker outside the limits of the State where he resides or is working without the prior consent in writing of the commissioner of agriculture for such State, or other official who performs similar functions for such State."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, a close reading of page 4 of this bill will show you that two entirely separate and distinct systems of recruiting and transporting are set up. Lines 8 to 13 on page 4 pro-

vide for recruiting and transporting within the State, and that is to be done by the State extension service. Lines 2 to 7, inclusive, set up a system for recruiting and transporting beyond the State, and that is to be done by the United States Employment Service under a general agreement with the Extension Service.

It would be most unfortunate if we permitted a system to be set up here, which would be accepted as instructions from the Congress, to permit the United States Employment Service to go into a county or a State where there is now a critical shortage of labor to recruit and transport those workers to other sections.

If you will refer to page 8 of the committee report you will find this language:

Before any transportation out of a county or State is effected clearance should be had with the appropriate county and State authorities so that local and State needs will not be jeopardized by an exodus which cannot be returned in time to meet the local or State crop requirements.

The amendment I propose is simply writing into the resolution and making a matter of law exactly what the committee has suggested should be the operation under the bill. I am advised that the amendment is entirely acceptable to the committee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia as revised and as just read to the House is in complete accord with the purpose and object of the bill. The committee is glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. PACE. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVINGER].

Mr. CLEVINGER. Mr. Chairman, I have here a letter from a large milk producer in my State who markets in the Cleveland milkshed. I shall not mention his name, but I shall read his letter:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, March 15, 1943.

DEAR CLIFF: The enclosed came to my desk this morning. It made me so damn mad I crushed it, then I thought I would send it on to you.

Notice affidavit farmer must sign to hire 1 of them 40 hours per week. My boys put in 70, and if they didn't I would close out, and I am shipping 3,000 pounds of milk daily. Will the fools in Washington ever learn any sense? Milk would need to retail for 30 cents per quart instead of 15 cents if my men went on a 40-hour basis.

I shall not read the postscript, as there is some language in it that I think had better be expurgated.

The affidavit to which he refers reads as follows:

This is to certify that I, \_\_\_\_\_, a farmer and resident of \_\_\_\_\_ County, \_\_\_\_\_ do own and operate a farm in the said county of \_\_\_\_\_, and that I am unable to work my farm in the proper manner because of the shortage of labor in this section.

I further certify that if Sergeant \_\_\_\_\_ is released from the Army of the United States to work with me on my farm, I will employ him steadily at the rate of \$20 per week for 40 hours per week plus room and board.

This affidavit is to be signed by the farmer, and it is to be sworn and subscribed to before a notary public.

This is the letter that caused this situation to arise:

CLEVELAND, OHIO, March 9, 1943.

DEAR SIR: My son, Sergeant \_\_\_\_\_, is interested in farm work. Has been in the Army 2 years February 20. He is stationed in Fort \_\_\_\_\_. If you are in need of help, he will be very glad to serve his country on the farm. I am his mother and would appreciate your consideration.

If milk and food must be produced on a 40-hour week, it may be that the farmers may have to join and unionize. Thirty-cent milk will not look so good to some of you.

I called The Adjutant General's office about this letter a while ago and asked about their regulations. The first time I called the man I talked to, he said this was not required, as far as the Army was concerned, and suggested that the county agent and probably two disinterested people sign this request for the boy to return. A little later he called my office and said that that was not particularly necessary, that the request was going to be returned to the local draft board for their action.

If you were serving on a local draft board, would you bring Sam Jones' boy home and leave Tom Brown's boy in the service? You are not going to get any men that way. These draft boards are only human, and they are the neighbors of the men who were sent.

Every day this food crisis gets worse. We have had many hearings about it, hearing Mr. Wickard one day, Mr. McNutt the next day, Mr. Hershey the next day, and Governor Townsend the next day. The ball went around the infield like the old Tinker-to-Evers-to-Chance combination, three up, three down, no hits, no runs, but a lot of errors, and no men for the Army.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLEVINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. What department of Government attempted to impose a 40-hour week on this farm?

Mr. CLEVINGER. I cannot tell the gentleman that. This is the copy of the affidavit the farmer was given to fill out to ask for the discharge of this soldier to serve on his farm.

Mr. CURTIS. Who furnished the affidavit, the War Department?

Mr. CLEVINGER. The letter does not say.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] is recognized.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, if it were not for the fact that there will be a scarcity of food for the American people during the next 12 months I would not favor this measure. But we all know that it takes man and machine power to produce food, and we do not have either the men or the machine power to provide all of the food that is required by the Government for our armed forces, the Allies, and for civilian needs.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] referred to this measure as a re-



lief measure for the farmers. That may be his idea of relief. If it is any kind of a relief measure, it is a relief measure for the American people so that they can get food. Personally, I feel that most of the damage has been done as far as farm labor is concerned. During the past 18 months approximately 3,600,000 workers have gone from the farms into the armed services and into the war industries. That is a lot of labor from the farms of America.

In the Middle West most of the damage has been done, because we operate in the dairy section where you need labor all the year round to take care of the dairy herds. We are asked to produce an increased amount of dairy products. Instead of securing that increase, it now looks as though we will have 20 or 30 percent less dairy products for the coming 12 months, which means strict rationing of butter, and possibly milk, throughout the country.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. As I understand, the gentleman represents a district where they raise corn. Today the ceiling on corn is so low that you cannot sell your corn for a price which it will cost you to raise it next year on account of the increase in farm labor. If they would spend this sum of money and raise the ceiling on corn we would get our labor, but today with the ceiling so low, we cannot look forward to raising next year's crop because we cannot pay the increased wages.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There may be something to what the lady says, but in our section Mr. Wickard would not let the farmers plant enough corn to feed their own livestock.

Now, a lot of blame has been put on Secretary Wickard for not taking care of this problem. I would like to clear that up. While he is partly responsible, there are others who are equally responsible. Mr. Wickard came before our committee a year ago in February. We also had Mr. McNutt, Mr. Hershey, and men from other agencies outside of the Department of Agriculture, where they have to do with manpower. We stressed to these officials the need for planning, in order to secure an adequate amount of farm labor for 1943, but we were told by Mr. Wickard and by Mr. McNutt and others that there would be an abundance of food, that we would have plenty of manpower, and they would not worry at all about it. In fact, I went so far as to ask Mr. Wickard to present this problem at a Cabinet meeting and he said it was not necessary to do that because he would take care of the situation. While they did not recognize this manpower shortage problem until along in October or November last year, we had predicted 8 or 9 months earlier that it was coming. Now we are facing a real serious situation when it comes to the production of food. We must have food for our armed forces and for the civilian needs of this country.

I heard Secretary Stimson speak the other evening in regard to the size of the Army. He mentioned nothing about

food and securing food for the Army or for the civilian population. I can see why he took the attitude that he did, because he knows the armed forces are going to get whatever food there is in the country, irrespective of the demands of the civilian population. Therefore, we in Congress must look after the food supply and the manpower to produce. I hope that this bill will aid in providing the manpower that is needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise to confirm the statements made by my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], and my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], on yesterday, who pointed out the specific requirements and the peculiar situation of those border States in the Southwest in regard to agricultural labor and our farm problems.

I am inclined to oppose the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL]. Something has been said about this bill's kicking the Department of Agriculture out of the picture. I cannot see it that way. It is true, this measure seeks to take this manpower problem away from the Farm Security Administration and put it in other agencies of Government, but I call attention to the fact that those other agencies of the Government are part of the Department of Agriculture.

Not only that, but they are older and more experienced and long-established agencies having to do with local control and having better acquaintance with local conditions. For that reason and because, although a good friend of the Farm Security Administration and willing to go to bat for them for the work for which their organization was recently established, I do believe, as I said earlier, that F. S. A. has fallen down on the job in my part of the country, and I am constrained to favor a change.

We have heard much said about trying to distribute something that does not exist—manpower. It may be there is a general shortage all over the country. It may be we will have some difficulty in getting farm laborers to go from one State to another. But down on the border in my State we have specialized crops that require seasonal work, and heretofore it has been supplied even in peacetime to a limited extent from our neighboring republic to the south. We are dependent during wartime for more of that labor, and if we cannot get it under proper conditions we simply cannot grow one of the very much needed agricultural products.

I refer particularly to long fiber cotton. Although I have no personal investments in American-Egyptian cotton, even in peace time I have done what I could to encourage its production, extend its markets and protect it from its greatest competitor from the Valley of the Nile. With the coming of war and the loss of our supply of silk, I urged consideration of this remarkable fiber in lieu of silk. It is today needed and wanted by the War

Department. With Mexico in this war as our ally, surely mutually satisfactory arrangements can be worked out so that a supply of this labor can be had.

In such international matters, even between friends and allies, it takes two to make a bargain. The Mexican government must be satisfied with any arrangement and our people, as a whole, must be satisfied. Now, the Mexican government rightfully insists on certain requirements for her citizens to come in here and I think we ought to be in position to meet those requirements, but to do it in a way that is satisfactory to the Republic of Mexico and not offensive or impossible of attainment to American citizens who want to hire them.

I take it for granted that the new agency in which we would place this power can do that as satisfactorily as any other agency of the Government. It will have to be a matter of negotiation with the Republic of Mexico. I want those imported laborers to be protected and their Government is going to see to that. I also want our country to be protected at the same time and that, I think, any sensible agency of the Government will also attend to.

But I do want to emphasize the need of getting this labor, because if we do not get it we cannot grow this long-fiber cotton. I am not in favor of a penny-pinching policy in regard to funds and what the Government must do in order to get this labor. It is going to take money to do this and do it right. For that reason I am opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. BELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes.

Mr. BELL. The gentleman just mentioned some requirements the Mexican Government is making. I wonder if the gentleman would enlighten us as to what they are asking to be done before we import these people.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Mexican Government requires certain minimum housing conditions and certain guaranties concerning pay.

Mr. BELL. What are the conditions concerning pay?

Mr. MURDOCK. I will not have time to be specific, but the whole controversy down in the Southwest has grown out of that very thing. It has been a technical matter of terms of contract and yet farmers have been paying more than the minimum. I believe that another agency of the Government is in better position to work this out on a satisfactory basis with the Mexican Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON].

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, I think in approaching this matter we should consider what is the fundamental purpose of passing this legislation. As I see it, a great many of the opponents to the plan offered have objected to it on the ground that the appropriation of \$26,000,000 for the purpose is too much.

I think the way to look at this is that we are trying to get production and if we are reasonably convinced that a larger amount than the \$12,000,000 suggested by the amendment will give us production, that is the kind of measure we ought to pass.

I am speaking today about this matter from my personal experience in the selective-service organization and also from my personal knowledge of the central part of California. In my district there are over 25 major crops raised: Vegetables, fruits, nuts, grapes, and things of that kind. In 1941, when we began the selective-service organization, we began to see that farms were being depleted of labor. That became more acute in 1942.

I want to correct an impression which several Members have given here, and that is that these men were taken by the selective service boards. Most of the young farmers in California, in the 12 boards over which I supervised appeals, voluntarily enlisted in the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps. As an illustration, practically every last man in the agricultural college of the University of California at Davis enlisted in the Army. Then any number of itinerant laborers were taken away by the selective service boards and the defense plants such as the Mare Island Navy Yard. The result was that we had a very acute labor shortage in 1942.

I think all of you know that for many, many years, in California, especially in that section that I am talking about, we have used Mexican labor and we have used itinerant labor.

One of the plans of this resolution is to import Mexican labor. Last year that was talked of and there were some Mexicans brought in for the harvesting of sugar beets and asparagus and other like crops.

The thing was a partial failure, but it was also a partial success and I am very anxious that we have this money in order that we may import as many Mexican laborers as we can into that area because I am confident the Californians know how to handle these men and will use them to the best advantage and will, with this added manpower, actually increase the production.

As I say, one of the main objections to this whole problem, one of the main difficulties in this whole problem, is that the people in authority have not taken the matter and discussed it from its broader aspects.

Last April the President of the United States, recognizing that we were in this total war where we would have to harness together all our physical resources and all our human resources, issued an Executive order on April 18, just exactly 11 months ago tomorrow, and here is what the chairman of the organization which was set up was supposed to do. He was supposed to—

Formulate plans and programs and establish basic national policies to insure the most effective mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower in the prosecution of the war; and issue such policy and operating directives as may be necessary thereto.

And also to—

Formulate legislative programs designed to facilitate the most effective mobilization and, utilization of the manpower of the country; and with the approval of the President, recommend such legislation as may be necessary for this purpose.

It is obvious that if almost one-third of the farm workers have been withdrawn by the armed forces or by industry that we must find some other source to make up this loss. The importation of Mexicans offers one source and will be extremely helpful in California. Volunteer labor, as pointed out by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], is another source; the release of workers on Government pay rolls; labor released from civilian sources and even from defense industries are other sources. Today much of the work in the country is done on a 40-hour week basis. If this were increased to 48 hours it is obvious that much manpower would be released. Women offer another source. It is clear that if we really want to produce more we must revise our plan and use one that will have the object in view. The 40-hour week plan was purposely designed to reduce production—and the bonus for overtime was designed to make the employer hire more help rather than work his people over the 40 hours. Now we are in a period when production—rather than reduced production—is our main object. In fact, it is our very salvation for the country can only win the war we are in—and thus save human lives—if our production in foods is better than ever before.

Some agency or person who has the authority to do so should furnish us with a comprehensive plan. That is what the Chairman of the Manpower Commission was ordered to do 11 months ago. But to date no pattern of this great effort has been made. If the farmers are given a chance they will deliver the goods, but so far every step taken seems designed to impede and obstruct production. For heaven's sake, when we are in a war of life or death we should get our plans drafted so as to effectively harness up the resources we have.

It is because this plan to import Mexicans will help this that I am for appropriating the larger amount, to wit: the \$26,000,000. I am heartily in favor of having the matter handled by the Extension Service. They know the farmers, their problems, and they understand them. This Service has been successful over a long period of time and the farmers have confidence in the Service. The farmers in our territory do not have confidence in the F. S. A. Consequently, I urge the defeat of the amendment and the passage of the original resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment pending at the desk, and I ask that it be read for the information of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be reported for the information of the House.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: Page 5, line 7, after "impose", insert "unreasonable."

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have time to discuss many things about this bill which I am afraid I will not have time to do. But, first, it is incumbent upon me to explain my amendment. One of the things which we on the west coast hope this bill will accomplish is the facilitation of the movement into our section of several thousand workers from our neighboring Republic of Mexico. We realize that our problem in this regard is different from the problems of many other parts of the country.

I recognize the fact that there are two distinct problems involved in this farm-labor situation. One is the problem of the steady, skilled "hired man" who works through the year on the farm and who needs to be a skilled man. I am not going to discuss that, nor do I think this bill is the answer to it. Real deferment from the draft is one answer. And there are one or two others that could be applied. But I cannot discuss them now.

The second problem is the problem of seasonal labor that is necessary in large numbers and of which in California we need at the peak about 250,000 at least over normal agricultural employment. In this connection, I frankly think we are going to have to rely on local people to meet most of this problem in most areas. So far as making arrangements for such help by local people, for the employment of high-school students and others, this should be in the hands of an agency that is rooted as firmly in the local community as possible. The extension service is such an agency.

Personally, I have advocated before, and I say again, that I wish all the contacts of the farmer with the Federal Government could be concentrated in one agency, his applications for gasoline, the securing of labor, his protest against price ceilings, his applications for machinery and everything else, and that this might be concentrated in the county war boards. This would do more to simplify the farmers present problems than anything else I know.

This bill says that the Extension Service is going to do the local recruitment part of this job and that it is to be responsible in cooperation with the Employment Service for the movement of workers from foreign countries or from one part of our country to another. So far as I am concerned, the main thing is to get definite responsibility fixed in the hands of some one agency. So far as western agriculture is concerned, as the gentleman from Arizona has already said, if we are to do the job in California that needs to be done, it is necessary that some arrangement be made with Mexico



so that several thousand of their people can help at doing that job.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment inserts the word "unreasonable" just before the words "minimum wages" or "housing standards", and the reason I offer it is because I do not see how we can make an agreement to bring workers in unless some kind of assurances as to reasonable standards of wage payment and where people are going to stay when they come to work can be given. I do not of course want workers brought in to our country temporarily to enjoy a favored position relative to workers of our own country. I do not think that should happen.

My own position is that agriculture, both the farmer and the farm worker have been depressed through the years and that neither the farmer nor his workers have received the income they should have. I join with other Members of the House in protesting a great many of the price ceilings for this reason. I support the idea that farm labor costs should be included in computing parity prices. But I hope we are not going to hamstring the administration of this measure by making it impossible for reasonable agreements and reasonable assurances to be given to people when they are recruited to go and do the work that we need to have done, because if the bill is finally enacted in its present form it may seriously affect the chance of securing the labor that we in the West are going to have to have. No one dislikes, on principle, more than I do, the importation of workers from foreign nations, but for this war period our California agriculture is absolutely dependent upon this being done.

Mr. Chairman, there is also another idea in my mind. It was expressed yesterday by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] when he pointed out that after all a large part of our reliance in meeting a great share of this problem of our farm work during this war is going to be upon the patriotism of our own people who will come out to help to get the job done. They have already done so in many cases—schools have been closed for certain periods in some of the States, farm and city people have turned out, farm people themselves have redoubled their efforts—but, with all of this, still the great seasonal labor problem of California and some other Western States cannot be met unless the Mexican workers come.

Now, I think it is necessary that some agency should have definite and exclusive responsibility for making arrangements for marshaling all the available local labor in each county and locality. This bill gives that responsibility to the Extension Service. I do not think that the Extension Service can do the job of bringing people from the neighboring Republic of Mexico or do the job of recruiting people in one part of our country for work elsewhere. I think that is going to have to be done by some national agency. Some time ago I recommended as earnestly as I knew how that a special section of the United States Employment Service should be set up exclusively devoted to agriculture because

I think that would have helped and will still help. This bill gives the Employment Service this latter responsibility.

I shall support this bill. But I want to say a word about the Farm Security Administration. I do not share most of the criticism of that agency that has been made by many people. I think there have been obstacles in the way of getting some of these things done which have not been the fault of Farm Security. I am not saying they have not made mistakes. But I am most earnestly in support of any program which attempts to help the small farmers and the migratory farm workers in this country, and I believe that agency has done great good in helping thousands of those families to raise their standards of living and to achieve a better level of production than they had before.

I earnestly appeal to the House to support my amendment. I will not have another opportunity to speak for my amendment. It expresses the purpose of the House that no unreasonable standard should be set, but it at least makes it possible for a Government agency which is going to recruit labor to give some assurance to those workers as to what they will receive for their work. I believe this is the simple duty of a governmental agency engaged in work of this kind. And I am convinced such reasonable assurances will be absolutely necessary if we are to obtain from our neighbor, Mexico, the workers which are absolutely necessary to our western agriculture. Furthermore, wages in excess of any reasonable minimum are already being paid by the farmer employers.

Farm income needs raising all along the line. And I remind the House of the point repeatedly made to the effect that one reason for the shortage of farm labor is the disparity between industrial and agricultural wages.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Does the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] desire recognition at this time?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Not at this time, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 4 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair feels constrained to point out that time has been limited.

The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to speak for 4 additional minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the rule prevent a request for additional time when debate has been limited?

The CHAIRMAN. It can be extended by unanimous consent.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I make the point of order that the time cannot be extended when it has been fixed, not even by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Any Member can object to the gentleman's request.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I can have no faith in legislation of the sort we are now discussing. I was brought up on a farm and own and operate some farm land now. I think I understand the difficulties and troubles that would beset a program such as is here proposed. I am fearful this scheme would be more likely to still further frustrate agriculture and reduce production rather than increase it.

Hand \$26,000,000 out to a group of people who have never had the responsibility of administering any substantial sums of money to operate a program of this kind and it is a foregone conclusion that the waste would be colossal, the good done small, and the damage great.

It appears to me Congress is here applying just a bit more salve to soothe the public mind. Until the political shackles are removed from the farmers and they are relieved of all bureaucratic meddling, and further, until they are able to secure freely all the farm machinery and supplies for their unhampered needs, the food shortage will increase no matter what else may be done. I think insofar as the farm-labor shortage can be relieved this can and will best be done if left entirely to local communities.

With respect to some of its operations, the Congress appears to have become a spectacle.

From the right side of the aisle and the left side of the aisle, largely irrespective of party affiliation, almost daily, curses rain down upon the bureaucracy. It is damned for just about every wrong that besets our social and economic body—for its stupidity, arrogance, extravagance and corruption; for food shortages and the attendant evils of rationing and price fixing and what not.

Yet the one and only cure which it seems the Congress possesses for each and every economic and social maladjustment or disease it diagnoses is more bureaucracy.

A food shortage impends. Among other serious factors a shortage of farm labor is manifest. The Congress can relieve this of course, for, judging from the great mass of laws it grinds out daily, it must believe itself capable of healing about all the ills, social, economic, as well as bodily, to which man and beast are heir.

So laboring under what M. Guizot called "a gross delusion, a belief in the sovereign power of political machinery," which, aside from its motivating forces, is the very alpha and omega of the New Deal, the Congress proposes to appropriate millions and create more political machinery to cure said farm labor shortage.

If the remedy works, well and good. The Congress then stands ready and willing to take full credit for the cure. If it fails and musses things up more, well and good, also, for could not Congress show that it had tried and is perfectly willing to try again by appropriating more funds and setting up more political machinery to do the job?

One is reminded in this connection of some of the earlier ideas of medicine. Hahnemann, founder of homeopathy, for example, propounded the peculiar doctrine that all chronic diseases were the result of the itch, syphilis, or scabies, or they were caused by medicines. He blamed the medicines given by doctors for being the cause of many diseases.

Well, speaking of one of the segments of the economy, the one we are at present concerned with—agriculture—we are pretty sure its troubles cannot be blamed on the itch or syphilis, but Congress surely has been giving the farmers a lot of medicines.

And, strangely, the very theory of therapeutics that guided old Dr. Hahnemann in his practice appears to be the one that gives direction to Congress in healing the ills of our social and economic body. Similia similibus curantur, like cures like, said Dr. Hahnemann. So when he had a patient suffering from what he believed to be the taking of some medicine, why, he would prescribe more medicine of the very same kind that made him sick to make him well again.

So with the Congress, bureaucracy has the country in the dog house, and to get it out of the dog house the Congress must prescribe more bureaucracy for the country.

This bill proposes to import 50,000, and we don't know how many more, Mexican farmers to take the place of our boys who left their farms in this country to go to war.

Mexico has declared war, on paper, on the Axis powers. She is supposed to be an ally of ours. We are giving her war supplies under lend-lease which she is using to build up her home defenses. She has no soldiers fighting in the war, and there is no indication she intends that they have any soldiers fighting on foreign soil.

This is a good example of lend-lease in reverse, of which we have been hearing so much lately. We take the young men of our own country from our farms and send them across the far seas to the four corners of the earth to keep the enemy away, not only from our own shores, but the shores of Mexico as well. Under lend-lease we give our war supplies away to Mexico—Mexico does not send any soldiers to fight, but sends us her farmers, whom we have to pay well, to take the place of our farmers who had to go to war.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make some observations. I am not going to attempt an argument because, being a lawyer, I could not make one in 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I was impressed with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. I feel that he has given us the best analysis of this bill that we have so far heard, though I do not entirely agree with him.

My good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Utah, said a few moments ago to me: "The country is asking for bread, but in passing this bill we are handing it a stone." That is what it amounts to. The Congress cannot do everything, notwithstanding a lot of people think so. I have heard here on the floor of this House the Agriculture Department kicked all over the lot for shortage of manpower. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that such kicking is another instance of play on prejudice that is gradually being developed against the administration in this House. I do not deny that politics are at the bottom of this.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard in the last few weeks speeches made on the floor of the House and one made here yesterday morning that under all of the circumstances I was sorry and regretted that they were made. We must not forget that we are in a terrible war. Our boys are being killed from the North Atlantic, where they were frozen to death with oars of boats in their frozen hands, trying to save their lives after escaping from a torpedoed ship, to the farthestmost point in the South Pacific and to the hot sands of Africa. These speeches serve no good purpose. It is my belief that if the Members of Congress quit fighting the Roosevelt family and direct their heavy guns toward our enemies, Hitler and the Japs, we might win this war much sooner than we are going to if we constantly snipe and jibe at our Commander in Chief and his family. These speeches are not confined to either side of the aisle. It is not vital to the perpetuity of this Government whether or not a Democrat or Republican Party survive as such, but it is vital to our country, yours and mine, should we lose this war.

I now want to call attention to the fact that we have a scarcity of farm labor. We have this scarcity for two reasons, and the two reasons are these: The inordinately high wages paid by war industry have taken boys off the farms, and the administration of the Draft Act, if you please, by the local boards, is the other reason. The local boards had discretion to defer farm boys, but in many instances they did not exercise it. The Agriculture Department is not to blame for that; but it is to blame for one thing, and its action is indefensible, in this respect, and that is this, failing to demand from the War Production Board sufficient steel with which to make adequate farm machinery to run the farms of this country for the year 1943.

First, I am informed that an order was made providing for production of new farm machinery amounting to 23 percent of the production of such machinery in the year 1940. Subsequently and a long time thereafter an order was made, yet not carried out, that the production should equal 40 percent of 1940. Per-

sonally, I happen to know that even last year we were unable to secure necessary farm machinery and repairs. If that were the situation last year what can we hope for this year with production decreased as indicated by the above percentages. If the War Production Board refused to comply with the reasonable demand made by the Agriculture Department, the Agriculture Department failed when it did not let the country know the true situation and where was the bottleneck. That is where it fell down.

I have been told on reasonably fair authority that only six-tenths of 1 percent of the steel of this country has been allocated to the production of new farm implements for the year 1943.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. It would take less than 1 percent of the steel produced today to furnish the farmer with all the machinery parts, and repairs required to produce all the food we and our allies need.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is exactly right. There is where the Department of Agriculture fell down. It did not stand on its hind legs and fight for adequate machinery from the War Production Board. That is one of the causes of the lack of food production.

If we pass this bill, if we give them all they ask, I doubt that we will increase the production of food. I do not believe you can transport men from California or Michigan to my State of Montana and get any results.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is contending that the appropriation of money will not produce food, that you still have to put the seed in the ground.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is only being practical. You must have men to work, and the appropriation of money will not furnish those men, though we can try.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the administration and the Congress seem to be suffering from an overdose of delusions, illusions, and hallucinations. Both seem to feel that the appropriation of money will produce the food. I do not believe it. Money will purchase food, it will not produce food.

The gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], who just left the floor, suggested that instead of making changes we devote our energies to the carrying on of this war, and part of that, the war program, naturally and inevitably must be the production of food. I go along with him on that, but I propose to fight anyone and everyone who gets in the way of the farmer who is trying to produce food.



for the fighting men and the home folks. This administration has been doing that right along.

I will give you a concrete illustration of just what I mean. In my own home county at a little crossroads is a farmers' co-op. They do business with farmers who live within a radius of about 6 miles and no more. During the past year the farmers in that community produced and this co-op shipped over 2,000,000 dozen eggs. They did a business of more than \$2,000,000. And the business made a profit. They produced, processed, sold, and delivered farm produce, that is food. What happened to them? Let me read you this letter I just received:

HAMILTON FARM BUREAU,  
Hamilton, Mich., March 11, 1943.  
Representative CLARE E. HOFFMAN,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CLARE: Last week, while in Washington, I told you about some of the problems which we were having. I found out, on my return home, that it has gotten more serious. We had filed an application for an increase in wages for most of our employees which took two of our employees about a day to get the information and fill out. Last week the application was returned, stating that it was not properly filled out and it probably will take two people another day to get the information they want.

In the meantime, our employees are leaving. Last week we lost three more in our egg department. They can leave here and go to Holland and work in a defense plant with much higher wages. We have closed up our egg-breaking department. Today we started handling part of our eggs on a current receipt basis as we do not have enough help to have them candled and graded. I am sure that our poultry-dressing department will operate at less than one-half of our capacity. We are having trouble in both of our feed plants, which is most serious. We are unable to take care of our feed customers and will have to turn down handling a large volume of poultry and eggs from our producers unless we get relief at once.

I do not believe that it is the intention of anyone that egg and poultry plants, such as we operate, should have to be closed down. Regulations which we have to comply with are too complicated and, in many cases, cannot even be interpreted by attorneys.

I am predicting that, unless we get relief, we will have to close up our poultry and egg departments before this summer is over.

I have warned State selective service headquarters in Michigan as far back as July 1941, that unless they changed their attitude toward agricultural workers being essential, that this country would face a food shortage. I am now predicting that the bottleneck which is developing in our food-processing plants in this country will be more critical than what food production has become.

We request that the regulations covering the freezing of wages be amended to exempt agricultural processing plant workers who operate in rural areas and on a substandard wage.

We all know that on account of war, that we will have to operate under some additional regulations, but we do hope and pray that Congress will see to it that these regulations be simplified so the average person can understand them and get the information that is required. These complicated regulations have caused a great deal of confusion and I know that many persons have violated a great many of these regulations. Last night our board of directors discussed whether it would be more practical to comply with many of the regulations we now

have to operate under and which are curtailing our operations, or to disregard them and make every effort to expand our food program which will help feed our people and shorten the war. Many firms have already violated many of these regulations and are facing being given a fine or a jail sentence.

Our problem is today, that we have too many regulations. Before long we will have more people trying to regulate than we will have in production and processing. This situation has become so acute that it is delaying our winning the war.

Sincerely yours,

HAMILTON FARM BUREAU,  
A. G. LOHMAN, Manager.

They have trouble keeping their employees. They have the men and the women in that community able and willing to grow the food and produce the poultry. These are second and third generation Hollanders, whose folks came originally from the Netherlands. They are honest, patriotic, industrious, thrifty, God-fearing people. They have the men and women, boys and girls to grow the things they want to process and ship. The employees are there. They have the money to pay them in competition with the wages paid in the nearby cities, where there are factories paying high wages in war production. They can produce. They have the equipment to process this food. But to keep their employees they want to pay wages to meet competition. What happens to them?

They make their application for permission to increase wages, not to cut them down, and the administration down here through one of the bureaus tells them that the application is not right. They have been trying for 2 weeks or more to get this permit. They are not dumb. They are not ignorant. They are successful business people and farmers.

To show you just how patriotic these Hollanders are, notice particularly this part of the letter:

Last night our board of directors discussed whether it would be more practical to comply with many of the regulations we now have to operate under and which are curtailing our operations, or to disregard them and make every effort to expand our food program which will help feed our people and shorten the war. Many firms have already violated many of these regulations and are facing being given a fine or a jail sentence.

The people who are producing and processing these foods, because of their patriotism, because of their realization that the boys—and many of their boys have gone and some have died—in the fighting forces must have this food, are now discussing the policy of going ahead and facing a fine or jail sentence or else complying with the regulations which hinder their efforts. They may be forced to violate the law in order to do their part toward feeding their own sons who are on the battle front.

I ask you, when the farmer is ready to go ahead, is there any reason why these fellows down below should not get off his neck and let him go? Must a man take the chance of paying a fine or going to jail in order to exercise the right of supplying those who need the food with that food? That is the situation. In-

stead of paying \$26,000,000 let the administration get off the farmer's back and let him go, especially when he is ready and has the ability.

Our ancestors, to make a profit, stole the Negroes from their homes, sold them to the southerners who wanted cheap labor, and we now have the so-called race problem. The last and the present generation wanted and they got the Japs on the west coast to do manual work, the stoop work so-called, and we now have the Japs on our hands.

Under this bill, as it reads at the moment, aliens can be brought in to aid, it is said, the farmer, and when the immediate need is over what will we do with them?

Let every other farm boy, every other hired man stay at home; give the farmers adequate farm machinery, free them from the shackles the administration has fastened upon them and they will produce.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman may withdraw his motion. There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL] for 5 minutes.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, when a patient is really ill they call for the experts. Sometimes they send for the experts and find that it was the coroner that they needed. At this late hour I do not know whether or not the experts can do much good, or whether the coroner can only view the remains, but I do well remember the old saying that perhaps the most impudent words are "I told you so." About 1 year ago, some may remember, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, said that before the end of 1943 we were going to have a strenuous food shortage and that no bureaucrat in Washington will do anything about it until it hits him square across the face. He was quoted all over the country. I said to you at that time, as some of you will remember in my short statement of 5 minutes, that before the end of 1943 there would be a wailing cry of "When do we eat?" Some folks may remember that. Since then much water has gone over the dam, but the sad part of it is that while we view the remains, with the coroner, the end is not yet. The desecration of the body still goes on. With an army of 11,000,000 plus in sight, so they say, there is more draining of farm labor still going on and yet to go on. We are told that the farm-labor shortage at this hour is the greatest shortage since 1922. What will it be by July; what will it be by next January? Oh, yes; some of our Members on both sides of the aisle who represent city districts treated the matter very lightly when the farm boys had the question up a year ago and we were talking about a 110-percent parity. We were outvoted.

Some of them, however, are consistent; they were opposed to doing anything then and are opposed now. However, some of the others have reversed themselves, and have seen their mistake. I remember one Member said here, we

may well hear from the consumer, and that we would hear from them last November, if farm prices were raised. However, we are hearing now, but their inquiry is "What can I get"? This bill may not do much good in some areas; but it may do much good some places, and whatever good it does, it is that much.

The Secretary of Agriculture has a veto power under the law on the O. P. A. farm prices when he chooses to use it. They are holding a meeting down town today, discussing the price of hogs. Let us hope that the price fixed will take into full consideration all the rise in prices of other things and hogs be kept at a price that will pay returns under all our present circumstances.

The standards made by the Selective Service Board for exemption of farm labor were too high. The War Production Board did not allot enough steel to make farm implements and repairs.

Real, experienced farm workers are as much war workers as millions of others and food production must have equal attention with other war production. I am supporting the resolution of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I thought I would take a few minutes to shed tears over the same body the preceding speaker, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL] referred to. I understand that my good friend from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN] held the wake this morning, but I am hopeful that perhaps we can provide a little artificial respiration with the pending measure. I cannot agree with my good friend, the genial gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL], who spoke yesterday, that the passage of this bill is going to do any harm to the Department of Agriculture. Certainly some blame must be placed somewhere for the failure of our present program, as far as farm manpower is concerned. If the blame has to be placed in the lap of the Secretary of Agriculture, let us put it there. If it is to be shared by the Farm Security Administration, then that agency has to accept its share of the blame. I would like to have you refer to the hearings on page 102, to a statement by Mr. Ogg, of the National Farm Bureau Federation. He had this to say:

Mr. Chairman, gentlemen of the committee: Speaking for the American Farm Bureau Federation, we feel that the present program of recruiting and placing farm labor is being very badly bungled, that it is not adequate to do the job, and that the best evidence of that is what has happened up to date. We have already lost very considerable quantities of food and fiber because of the bungling of the farm labor recruitment program.

I heartily subscribe to that statement. If we have to take this thing out of the hands of the Farm Security Administration, or even the Department of Agriculture, let us do it. It may not be too late. I think we can still render some valuable assistance in insuring a supply of farm

labor for harvesting food crops during the 1943 season. At least we can try.

On page 119 of the hearings appears a statement by a gentleman representing the farmers in Florida, with reference to the activities of the Farm Security Administration:

I condemn them to the fullest extent as being impractical, cumbersome, and dripping with red tape and reform. Apparently social reform is all the Farm Security Administration people have in mind. While our crops wilt and rot they dilly-dally dawdle around with all their foolishness.

There is another statement I subscribe to 100 percent. We have had some experience in California with the Farm Security Administration attempting to import Mexican labor to help harvest our crops. It looks to me as though the Farm Security Administration is more interested in teaching Mexican laborers to eat steak and pie instead of tortillas and frioles than in harvesting our crops. Enough of social reforms and confusion—let us have some action.

Yesterday the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] referred to the cost of this program. May I point out that last year, due to the shortage of agricultural labor in the State of California alone, crops were lost to the extent of nearly \$10,000,000. According to the hearings, in Arizona last year cotton and alfalfa amounting to approximately \$5,000,000 was lost. There is more than half the cost of this projected Nation-wide program in two States alone. If it is going to take \$26,000,000 to put this program over, I am for it. However, I am for taking it out of the hands of the agencies that have proven themselves utterly incapable of handling the task. The recruitment and placement of farm labor should be handled by persons who are familiar with farmers and farm problems.

Yesterday, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEFFEL] made a very moving argument in behalf of community cooperation. I want the gentleman from Wisconsin to understand that his particular congressional district has no corner on patriotism in that regard.

The President of the United States, following his trip to the Pacific coast, referred to the fine community cooperation in my congressional district, where they closed banking houses and business houses and the citizens of the communities went onto the farms and helped harvest the prune and tomato crops. They did a miraculous job. But that is not enough. When thousands of tons of fresh peaches, thousands of tons of fresh apricots, thousands of tons of prunes or other valuable crops are rotting on the trees and on the ground, community cooperation is not enough. We must have a supplemental supply of labor, and the only place for it to come from now is from Mexico.

The Government of Mexico can do more to implement the good-neighbor policy by assisting the United States in recruiting an adequate supply of farm labor than any other one thing I know of. As our allies in the present war I am sure everything possible will be done.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that this bill be passed as is, and that the pending amendments be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEWART].

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, this bill is worth \$26,000,000 for one part of it alone, that is, going back and recognizing local government, where the county commissioners appoint the county agents and the people have really got some voice in their National Government.

The experiment, from a local governmental standpoint, is worthy of consideration. In all probability the speaker addressing you will never be selected to administer the policy of the Nation, but I think there has been too much concentration in Washington, trying to carry out party lines against the welfare of the Nation. There is no reason why this Congress and this Government should not recognize the agricultural bureaus and State boards of agriculture in the respective agricultural States and other agencies that deal with agriculture.

One other thing: We ought to have some practical farmers in authority dealing with the actual farmers, because the documents that have been produced and read in the form of labor contracts, and menus compelling filet mignon a la Stanley for Mexican laborers, goes to show that it was not the idea of a man that knew anything about farming.

Mr. McMURRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEWART. Not now. I will yield when I have concluded.

The people of America are looking to Congress. We have a big job, because we cannot administer the law to where it will work out, with one jurisdiction conflicting with and intertangling with another; but we could send back to the agricultural States our Federal money and recognize our agricultural agents as this bill provides, and when it gets to the county, the county commissioners have authority to veto or O. K. the contract with the county agent. That county agent has to cultivate the good will of the farmers of the county he represents, in order to hold his job.

I am opposed to all amendments save and except the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. I think his amendment will strengthen the bill and stop the useless expense of transporting farm labor from one point of the United States and back a time or two, without results, and I am going along with that amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take a little different slant on this particular item than has been presented here today. I believe the Agriculture Committee would have brought out a little different bill. The fact that someone in their wisdom did not turn it over to the Agriculture Com-



mittee is not going to influence me as to what parts of it I expect to support.

There are two particular things I would like to call attention to. The first is that there is not much use of appropriating money for anything on this food program as long as you let the O. P. A. run around and put everybody in a straitjacket. Many of their rulings are not even according to law. The second is, I would like to call your attention to the break-down for this bill. Under the present proposal we have some \$13,500,000 for the Extension Service, and \$12,500,000 for the recruitment, transportation, supervision, and protection of domestic workers. Among this \$13,500,000 for extension work, on the face of it it would appear to me that possibly two and a half million dollars for interstate transportation and supervision looks rather high. This amount should not be needed for this purpose. This \$5,000,000 for temporary housing, including construction of additional facilities, rentals, operations, and supervision of existing facilities, surely seems out of line, and altogether too much money, and much more than is needed for this purpose.

We talk about \$26,000,000, and my good friend the gentleman from Virginia yesterday told us about the mandate from the people of this country. I would just like to call attention to the fact that we appropriated and expended last year out of the United States Treasury \$71,778,000 and gave it to the big landowners of this country. We gave this amount in checks of from \$1,000 up. Since these big operators are getting \$71,000,000 subsidy payments, they should be able to recruit and provide for their own labor without additional requests from the United States Treasury. First, let us take the great State of California, where we find that 2,332 of the good farmers out there were able to get \$6,000,000 plus.

I call attention to Texas because that was where this border labor comes in. We have about 6,000 farmers getting something over \$12,000,000, or about \$2,000 each. Do you not believe that these large operators should be able to recruit their own labor without additional appropriations from the United States Treasury? I call to the attention of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] that 25 big land operators in his State received \$44,000 as subsidy in the one year.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Yes, sir. Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say to the gentleman that I have always voted against every one of these subsidies without exception.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I am sure of that. The gentleman from Virginia will admit, though, that, as far as subsidies are concerned, we have been doing it for several years.

Many times we have tried to reduce these large payments to \$500, but to no avail, and evidently they are to be continued even in wartime.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman will also recall that this is supposed to be a rejuvenated Congress with

a specific mandate, and I think he ought to be careful about that mandate.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. The distinguished gentleman from Virginia is so compelling in his argument. I must admit that he can be depended upon to curtail these nonmilitary expenditures. He can also expect continued cooperation on my part. The Tarver amendment should be supported and the appropriation reduced from \$26,000,000 to \$12,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] is recognized.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, this bill, or a part of it, may do some good, but at most I am unable to see where it is going to do very much good, because I do not think it is the proper approach to the problem. This bill would appropriate \$26,000,000 to assemble, house, and train farm labor. Frankly, I think if we will take the clamps off of the farmer so he can get a fair price for his products he will be able to find and pay for his own labor.

A strange thing about this bill is that there seems to be a lack of confidence in just what it will accomplish, even on the part of those who advocate it. There are too many "ifs" involved. It is farm or agricultural legislation coming from the Appropriations Committee instead of the Agriculture Committee.

The present O. P. A. Director is exercising more control over not only this problem but over agriculture in general than any other department, man, or organization, including the Congress of the United States today. I do wish the Department of Agriculture would wake up and quit being a "yes" department to O. P. A. officials.

I might say that I am informed that one of the big reasons why Mr. Brown is O. P. A. Director instead of United States Senator from Michigan, the office held by him prior to November 1942, is because he blocked the solution to this very problem last year by opposing the inclusion of labor costs in the price of agricultural commodities and therefore the people decided that maybe Mr. Brown would be better off somewhere else. I suppose he was conscientiously opposed to it then, and is now, for he, Mr. Brown, or the O. P. A., which he heads, leaves approximately \$1 or \$1.25 per day labor costs in the price of farm commodities. Now you and I know that you cannot get labor on the farms at that price, and so does Mr. Brown and his associates. Labor is now in the competitive field and the Government put it there. You can set up a \$50,000,000 outfit, if you want to, with the theory of this bill in mind or for the purpose of assembling, collecting, and training agricultural workers, but, first, you must find the workers; and second, they must agree to work on the farms, and not only have they got to agree to work on the farms, but they must agree to work on the farm for at least half or less than half of the price paid for labor by industry in Government camps, the munitions factories, and so forth.

So where are you? You are just left out in the cold, so far as that is concerned, and the solution to the problem still remains first, more agricultural machinery and second, more money to the farmer for his products, for without more money they will be unable to pay the market price for labor and if the farmer cannot go into the labor market and pay a competitive price, he cannot and will not get it. Why should we try to fool ourselves?

Now, I have great faith and confidence in my friend from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I want to read some of his words that are just as sound today as they were on September 22, 1942, when he uttered them.

Quoting from the RECORD, the gentleman said:

Crops already made are not being harvested because, at current prices, they will not bring enough to pay a wage sufficient to draw farm labor away from war industries which have lured it from the farms. Industry can pay large wages because it gets a fair price for its products with the cost of labor figured in, but the farmer cannot pay high wages because, under this bill, you propose to so reduce the price of his product as to leave no margin for increased wages.

And again on the same day he said:

If you vote for this bill as it is written, as it is presented to you here without amendment—to include the farmer's cost of production as you include every other producer's cost of production—you are voting to prolong the war and you are voting away certainty of early and perhaps complete victory.

Then the gentleman was asked:

I should like to ask him if it is not his considered judgment that we face a grave shortage of food within the next year unless the farmer is given equal protection with the wage earner of the country?

To which he replied:

Beyond the peradventure of a doubt the consuming public does not appreciate that fact as yet.

The gentleman stated further:

In the future when the proponents of low farm prices begin to appreciate the situation it will be too late, it will then be irreparable and the country will understand what this loss means.

And we are now beginning to learn what it means.

He further stated:

Sweatshop conditions are not permitted in the city, but they are found on every farm. Child labor is prohibited in the factory, but it is the rule on the farm. And now that farm prices are being reduced 10 percent and factory wages raised 15 percent under this bill, is it to be wondered that men are closing down the farms and taking their families to the cities? It is the life of Riley in the city as compared to life on the farm as it will be under the administration of this bill.

This was said during the debate which took place when those of us who were interested in the farmer and understood his problems were trying to get cost of labor included in the formula for parity so that it could not be disregarded in fixing maximum prices on agricultural commodities. We had just as well be plain about it, the big cities and the so-called leaders of industrial workers want cheap food; and they do not care how many

hours per day the farmer has to work, they do not care how much child labor is used, they do not care about his standard of living, they want cheap food. And take the position that anyone advocating a fair price for farm produce the only thing that will insure an adequate supply of food, is bringing about inflation. John L. Lewis does not see any inflation in raising the miners' pay \$2 per day. But he and those of his school of thought contend that if you pay the producer of food 50 percent as much in wages as is paid those who produce coal, it would be inflation. I do not believe that position or attitude is fair, honest, good Americanism or to the best interest of this Nation in winning the war, one of the great needs now is for food if we continue to hamper its production we will be hampering and hindering this country's war effort.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, we must agree there are three essential things to win the war: We must have adequate manpower for our armed forces, produce the necessary war equipment, and provide food.

We began in 1940 to build up our armed forces. Strong appeals were made to our young men to enlist in our armed forces. They were urged to volunteer their services in defense of our country. They were told it was their patriotic duty to do so, and millions did volunteer. The Selective Service Act was passed, and other millions were brought into the armed forces.

So today we find ourselves with an armed force greater than we have facilities to transport it to the combat areas, but efforts are being put forth to increase the number to 11,000,000 or more.

About the same time in 1940 we put on a great campaign to produce war equipment of all kinds. The munition plants offered high wages, short hours, and attractive working conditions, and we rapidly built up our war plant forces; and we can say today that we have made splendid progress and are expanding day by day.

But the first requirement of the trinity necessary to win the war has been neglected. During the years of 1940, 1941, and 1942 we persisted in following the policy of cut-outs and reducing acreage in the production of food in this country. We paid the farmers bonuses and benefits to reduce their acreage and cut down their production. Many of us for more than a year insisted that if something was not done to increase our production on the farms that the Nation would face an acute food shortage, but the administration failed to heed these appeals. The urge became stronger for the young men of the farms to enlist in the service of our country, and wages in the defense plants and other units of industry continued to advance. Approximately 3,500,000 farmers and farm workers were drawn from the farms of this country. It is estimated about 40 percent of this number entered the armed forces and the other 60 percent was attracted to industry by the high

wages, short hours, and more favorable working conditions.

The farmers of the Nation could not pay the wages, grant the shorter hours or the better working conditions to keep men on the farms. During this time the administration refused to include cost of labor in fixing parity prices for the farmers and refused to give to the farmers such a price for their commodities as would enable them to compete in the labor market with industry. Although it was self-evident that unless some steps were taken our country would be faced with a food shortage and the American people would experience acute hunger, no workable plan was offered by the administration for the solution of this problem.

The farmers were further handicapped by the rules and regulations issued by the thousands from the numerous offices of the bureaucrats here in Washington. Men without knowledge or experience were undertaking to run the farms of the Nation. Because of these unworkable policies, the farmers are not able to secure necessary farm machinery, fertilizer, oil, gas, seed, and so forth. Millions of man-days have been lost by the farmers on account of the red tape of the bureaucrats here in Washington, in visiting the country seats and the State capitals of their respective counties and States in trying to secure machinery, fertilizer, oil, gas, seed, and so forth, and in filling out millions of forms by the farmers, and which forms confused the farmers as to what they could or could not do on the farms. It is most regrettable a lot of these orders, regulations and red tape are still in force to confuse and delay the farmers.

The administration insisted upon taking men into the armed forces faster than they had facilities with which to train them and in numbers greater than we had or have facilities to transport them to the battle front. We know of instances in our district where two or three sons were taken from a single farm, leaving behind an aged father or mother to carry on the farm work. There was no clearly defined policy promulgated or followed to determine to what extent farmers or farm workers should be deferred. The policy as to the deferment of men in industry was more clearly defined and more consistently followed.

The administration did not wake up to the gravity of the situation until late in November 1942. It was not until November 30, 1942, when an order was issued for the stabilization of farm workers. The President issued his food-production-processing order on December 5, 1942. Mr. McNutt, Chairman of the Manpower Commission, issued his order relative to farm labor on January 10, 1943, but from 1940 up to 1942 we were still following the policy of cut-outs in farm production and the payment of bonuses and benefits not to produce food and fiber. The administration stuck to its policy of scarcity. It still labored under the delusion we might have too much meat, corn, wheat, cotton, sugar, potatoes, peanuts, and other farm commodities. Our country is now suffering

from the administration's policy of scarcity instead of plenty, but the administration has suddenly waked up to the specter of a food famine now confronting the Nation, and legislation is attempted after the crops have been planted in many parts of the country and some crops are ready to harvest.

We have concentrated since 1940 on building up our armed forces and the production of war equipment and matériel. We must now concentrate our efforts on production on the farms. The farms alone must provide us with the food, the feed, and clothing.

#### SERVE WHEREVER NECESSARY

I am not urging that anyone be permitted, if he should desire, to avoid service in our armed forces. I have but one son who was married several years before the war. He volunteered for duty in a combat unit of the Coast Artillery and is now in the service. He is neither a farmer nor a skilled workman. He can be more useful in the armed forces than he could be on the farm or in a war-production plant. I feel that every patriotic American should be willing to perform whatever service that will be most helpful in winning the war. No language can express the appreciation and gratitude of the American people for the courageous and patriotic service that our boys are giving to our country—on land and sea, in the air, and under the sea—yet we must not forget that our armed forces must have food and clothing; that we must have ships, bombers, planes, tanks, guns, shells, and other war materials. They cannot fight without these. They should have the very best our country can provide. They cannot bring us victory without them. In order to have these, men and women must toil on the farms, in the ships, mills, factories, mines, railroads, and other instrumentalities of production and transportation.

If our Government says that one group can be most helpful on the farm, another group in the factories and mines, and yet another in the armed forces, and the individuals of each one of these groups puts into his service whether on the farm or in the defense plants or in the armed forces, his best efforts with a great patriotic desire to serve his country and bring victory, he should not be frowned upon, but receive the commendation and the gratitude of the American people.

It is difficult to keep young men and young women on the farms when they can receive from two to five times as much wages in industry per day as they receive on the farms and at the same time have much shorter hours of service. The shops and factories are heated in the winter and are much cooler than on the farm in the summertime. They are not exposed to the scorching heat of summer or to the rain, the snow, and the sleet of winter. The farm or shop does not provide the glory or the glamour of the armed forces. Some of our young men on the farms and in the shops who could be deferred feel that it is their patriotic duty to march and fight under the flag of our country.



## HELP THE FARMERS

We have before us today House Joint Resolution 96, reported by the Committee on Appropriations. This bill provides for an appropriation of \$26,100,000 to be turned over to the Extension Service of the Agriculture Department to aid in recruiting, training, and placement of farm labor, and to secure labor and in certain cases provide for their transportation.

I am supporting this measure because it is urged by the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Agriculture, and in the hope that it will relieve the farm-labor shortage at least to some considerable extent, but this may only scratch the surface. Farm machinery and other farm equipment—seed, fertilizer, oil, and gas must be made available at once to the farmers.

I voted for the Brown amendment to the Price Control Act, providing that in fixing the parity price for the farmers' products the labor cost should be included. This was adopted by the House over the objection of the President. While the Senate passed that bill and it was signed by the President, yet the administration has failed to carry out this express mandate of Congress.

In a day or two we are informed that H. R. 1408 will come up to write into the law clearly and explicitly that the costs of labor shall be included in fixing parity prices. I shall vote for that bill if given an opportunity.

The Committee on Agriculture has before it House Concurrent Resolution 12, introduced on March 9, 1943. This resolution very properly declares that the production of adequate supplies of food, feed, and fiber is essential to the prosecution of the war as the production and manufacture of actual munitions of war. It further points out that the farmers are handicapped in obtaining farm equipment, machinery, and supplies that are needed in order to produce this food, feed, and fiber.

The Congress commends the farmers of the United States for the manner in which they have shown their patriotism in response to the demands made upon them to aid in the effective prosecution of the war. I heartily concur in the words of praise to the farmers of the Nation, but they need something besides resolutions. They need new farm equipment, seed, fertilizer, oil and gas, and then they need a fair and just price for their products, and we must not continue the policy of stripping the farms of their manpower.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee if I may be permitted to use the additional 5 minutes which it is understood I was to have at the time debate under the 5-minute rule on this amendment was fixed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in my request I asked that the gentleman from South Carolina be accorded 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from South Carolina may proceed for 10 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL] for referring to the statement I made way back in 1942. I realized at that time, and the members of my committee realized, just what was going on and just what the people of this country might expect. My committee for many months has been working overtime to get over to the heads of the various agencies connected with our war program, the Congress, and the President of the United States, the position of agriculture, and just what was being done to the farmers instead of being done in the interest of the farmers of this country. At that time I stated that nothing would be done about it until early some morning when those in authority would arise and find nothing to eat; then we should find the different agencies, the Congress, and everybody else running all over each other spending millions trying to do that which cannot be done on the farm overnight. I fear that it is too late now for 1943, but we must do something and do it now, not only to be helpful in 1943 but to take care of 1944.

On yesterday and today we have heard many Members state on the floor of this House that this bill now under consideration will not cure the serious situation confronting the farmers of the country, that is, the labor shortage. Let me say to you that I agree with those gentlemen that it will not. The people in California and perhaps one or two other sections of the country where Mexican labor may possibly be secured may get something out of this bill, and I hope they will. The other day when the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] asked any Member who had a surplus of labor in his district to stand and let the Members know about it not a single Member rose to his feet. Perhaps in the South we may be in a little better shape, so far as labor is concerned, than most any other agricultural section of the country, but unless something is done quickly and definitely about this serious situation we are going to remain in the serious position we are insofar as bringing about even a normal production in 1943, when at this time more than any other time in the history of this great Republic we need to increase our production which is so necessary not only to win this war but to win a just and lasting world peace.

I will tell you about the position of agriculture. From the very beginning of our war program the various agencies connected with our war effort have left agriculture out of the picture; they have made a stepchild out of the Department of Agriculture and the farmers of this country. The Manpower Commission and those connected with industry have been interested in getting employees into industry. The employment agencies scattered all over the country have been working overtime sending employees to Government jobs and to war industries.

The War Department stated that so far as agriculture was concerned that was Secretary Wickard's racket. The War Department is interested only in getting every man possible to build up a ten- or fifteen-million-man Army when, as a matter of fact, they cannot possibly get across during 1943 over four to four and a half million men.

In every instance when the Secretary would ask for more critical materials for farm machinery they would make promises, but that is all. The last promise they made was to give 50 percent of the total of 1941. To this good hour, however, they have received perhaps 25 percent; and the distribution of farm machinery implements and repair parts are tied up with red tape. Let me tell you you are not going to produce anything like a normal crop this year with the position the farmers are in today—short of necessary farm machinery, unfair prices, many rules, regulations, and restrictions, and unfair ceilings and farm prices, and the shortage of labor. There is, however, one thing that can be done that will go a long way to help the situation and that is to stop taking farmers, their sons, and laborers from the farms which they are still doing even to the last man in a great many instances. I challenge any Member to stand up and tell me they are not now doing that very thing in his district. They are doing that in my district and they are doing that in your district. They plan to take many more millions into the armed services of this country awaiting the time when it may be possible to take them overseas. There are many trained farmers and trained laborers who can be furloughed back to the farm to do the thing that is necessary to win this war. I want to request the Members to pay strict attention to the reading of an amendment I propose to offer and that I now request, Mr. Chairman, be read for the information of the Members.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the proposed amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment to be offered by Mr. FULMER: Page 5, after line 14, insert the following:

"Sec. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, every individual who was regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor in any capacity in connection with the production of any agricultural commodity during a major part of the calendar year of 1942, and who, on the date of enactment of this joint resolution or on the date thereafter on which such individual receives orders to report for induction into the land or naval forces of the United States, is regularly engaged in any capacity in connection with the production of any agricultural commodity shall be deferred from training and service under such act until January 1, 1944, or until the date on which such individual ceases to be regularly engaged in any capacity in connection with the production of any such commodity, whichever first occurs. As used in the foregoing sentence the term 'production of any agricultural commodity' includes the raising, feeding, caring for, and management of any dairy animals or other livestock or poultry."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the amendment is read at this time for information.

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that it may be that this amendment is not germane, but if the gentleman will not raise that point I do not believe there is a single Member of Congress here that will raise the point.

Unless something is done, and done promptly, I hate to think just what will happen in connection with the winning of this war. I am sure you will agree with me you cannot "keep 'em flying" or "keep 'em rolling" unless you can keep them eating. Today millions of people are practically starving in Europe, and we are rationing food in this country at this time. Think for a moment what it would mean in saving the lives of our men if we are able to keep our allies supplied and keep them fighting. This amendment, if adopted, could keep the rest of the people on the farm who have not been drafted. However, the gentleman can make the point of order, and no doubt it will be sustained. But I ask you seriously how you are going to help the farmers of this country to produce a normal crop unless you can keep them down on the farm.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am in heartiest accord with the statement made by the gentleman from South Carolina. In the remarks I myself made on the floor yesterday I called attention to the fact that if exemption of keymen on essential farms had been allowed a year ago, or beginning at the time I made the statement, we would not have today the situation that we are here trying to alleviate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute in view of the fact that I took some of his time.

Mr. MORRISON of North Carolina. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, I do not feel that there is much that I can add to the discussion of the measure now before us—House Joint Resolution 96. It has been explained and defended very competently by both the majority and minority members of the committee. However, there is one thing that I do want to say to you definitely.

I am heartily in accord with the provisions of this resolution placing the responsibility for the recruiting of farm labor in the hands of the Agricultural Extension Service. This Service in my State is in the hands of a competent and

reliable group of men at Purdue University. I rest this problem in their hands.

The Extension Service has a great organization set up all over this country in every agricultural county and State in the Union. They are all ready to go. They are functioning. The farmers have confidence in them. Under the terms of this resolution, they are given \$6,000,000 to do what they can to stimulate the recruitment of agricultural labor. If anything can be done to relieve this situation, they are in a position to do it.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard testimony to the effect that, although the Department of Agriculture and the Farm Security Administration have been working on this problem for nearly a year and have expended several million dollars, they have succeeded in recruiting little or no labor. They have failed to even scratch the surface.

I therefore feel that the Congress is thoroughly justified in turning this program over to the Extension Service, a far-flung, effective organization with a record of 70 years of solid accomplishment. At least I am willing to give them the necessary funds and authority to tackle this most important problem. The need for immediate action cannot be disputed. With the threat of food shortages ahead, with all they can mean not only to this country but to our allies, we cannot afford to take chances.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida, [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us causes us to realize the more that we are groping in the dark and lost in the wilderness. When the Office of Price Administration bill was before the House, many of us contended that there should be no ceiling on farm commodities. The best we could get was the Brown amendment which established 90 percent of parity.

The O. P. A. ceiling set on farm produce has throttled and threatens to stop farm production. I do not entertain the theory that an increase of farm commodity prices will bring about wild inflation. When the O. P. A. bill was before the House it was determined to put no ceiling on wages, which probably was wise. It was determined at the same time to put a ceiling on agricultural commodity prices. In other words, the philosophy then obtaining was that it is all right to have big wages, it is all right to produce, but we are not concerned about your getting food.

The call to the armed forces and the call of high wages in industry has depleted the supply of labor on the farms and stalled production. We cannot get around the fact that the way to bring about factory production, raw material produce production, and machine production, is to allow the producers to have the certain knowledge that the product will bring the cost of production plus a reasonable profit. If the farmers of this Nation could be assured that their commodities would bring the cost of production and a reasonable profit, the problem would be solved.

In almost every farm county in the United States there is a county agricul-

tural agent, and these men are performing well. Each of them knows what can be produced in his county and how to bring it about. Instead of hunting nostrums as we are in this monstrosity before us, which I shall probably vote for because nothing else is now offered, knowing however it will not answer the emergency. If we should authorize and direct that these county farm agents should stimulate production in an orderly manner in their counties by means of the Commodity Purchasing Corporation of the Department of Agriculture guaranteeing certain prices for the produce of the farm, labor would go to the farm.

Do you think it is practical to go into depleted farm labor areas—and they are all that—and recruit labor and carry it to another depleted farm area? You are robbing Peter to pay Paul. The only method by which you can get this labor is to let the farmer himself get his own labor through the definite knowledge that he will receive the cost of what he produces plus a reasonable profit. You have the machinery already set up through the county farm agents for a plan like this, but the lust of bureaucracy has grown so great in this Nation and percolated so deeply into Congress that you are afraid to challenge it.

It is the duty of the Congress to face this situation in a realistic, practical manner and to apply to the subject business yardsticks. In other words, we should approach this subject the same as any other important business subject in connection with the war effort. In the Department of Agriculture we already have an agency which has been utilized for the purchase of commodities. This agency, with additional power and authority, could very well be used as a Federal purchasing agency for food commodities. It is clear in my mind that if such agency had the power to purchase at stated prices, such power of purchase would rarely be exercised. In other words, the fact that such Federal organization was given the power and direction to purchase food commodities at a certain price would definitely set the price of such commodity, then the usual channels of trade would buy and pay for such commodity the indicated price. I am confident that such purchasing medium would never have to utilize in its operation in excess of \$5,000,000—perhaps only \$1,000,000.

The county farm agents are already in position to know the food-producing possibilities of their respective counties. They know the individual farms and the majority of the individual farmers on same. The Secretary of Agriculture could immediately arrive at the desired amount needed of each regularly produced food crop. These respective amounts could be disseminated as production goals and prorated according to the ability to produce to the various counties in the country. In fact, such arrangement and promulgations could be, if red tape could be cut, carried forth in less than 10 days. The price so fixed for the various food commodities should



be sufficient to give the farmer cost of production plus a reasonable profit.

In fixing this cost of production and price of food commodities at the farm, consideration would be given to sufficient farm wage to be paid as will offer adequate inducement to labor in order that the farmer may be enabled to obtain such labor. The farmer himself, if given sufficient price for his commodity, can undoubtedly secure adequate labor to produce. He should be enabled, in such food-production program, to compete with salaries and wages paid to industrial and war workers adjacent to his farm community. It would be infinitely better for the consumer to pay more for the food that he eats, in an orderly way and through the regular processes and channels of trade and through regular and orderly processes of farm production in the farmers' own manner, than for the Federal Government to appropriate the \$26,000,000 as indicated in this bill to attempt to subsidize the farm-labor situation. The American people ultimately will be called upon to pay the \$26,000,000 as indicated in this bill. The average American would get his food cheaper if all Price Administration ceilings on farm commodities could be scrapped and if inducements for production were made by guaranteeing to the farmer cost of production plus reasonable profit.

Now, my colleagues, there is no use in trying to fool ourselves. This theoretical, itinerant, migratory, ultra bureaucratic plan before you today is not the solution. The American factory owner is now producing airplanes successfully because he knows in advance that he will get the cost of that airplane plus reasonable profit. This same thing applies in every material, product, and manufactured article used in the war effort. This is a common business principle and the only way we are going to get adequate food production on the farms in America is to apply a similar business plan. Ceiling prices placed by the O. P. A. on milk produced in the State of Florida are forcing dairymen to sell their cattle for beef and retire from the dairy business. Vegetable and potato growers and long-staple cotton growers in Florida are unable to adequately expand for production because of ceiling and floor prices set by the O. P. A. which are prohibitive and destructive to these industries. These same inadequate ceiling and floor or support prices as set on other commodities has practically stopped production in its tracks.

Yes; some of my colleagues have gloated about the great food production, say, in 1929, 1930, 1931, 1932, and 1933 of farm produce. I recall that very well. The elevators were bursting with grain; barns were filled with hay; cattle and hogs roamed the pastures and highways; cotton yielded abundantly. But did you ever stop to think about it, at that particular time, there were probably more hungry Americans than at any time during our Nation's existence? Corn sold for 10 cents a bushel; wheat, 15 cents or 20 cents; cotton, 5 cents and 6 cents a pound; pork, beef, and other commodities were low. But the American people

were hungry, millions of them, because they had nothing with which to buy food. Factories were idle and farmers were burning corn for fuel because they could not buy coal. Coal miners were hungry for corn and wheat and other edible products because they had no employment and no money with which to buy food. That was under the Republican Administration of President Hoover.

I have at all times favored Government encouragement of abundance of production and have lamented destruction of food things of value. I always doubted the wisdom of the plowing under program and of the hog destruction program. But, my colleagues, that is neither here nor there. We are faced with a serious situation which, unless remedied, will eventually bring hunger to our people and to the Allies depending upon us. And may I suggest to you Members who represent city districts, your constituents may be the first to be hungry because it is expected that the farm producers should first feed their families and then their nearest neighbors. You should be interested in this, and I know you are.

I trust that the Committee on Agriculture will give immediate and serious thought to this matter and agree to legislation which will without red tape delaying and fantastic bureaucracy, inaugurate a program immediately of guaranty of cost of production plus reasonable profit. This is, in my opinion, the only practical and workable method of approach.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT] be given as much of my time as he may need.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, about 18 months ago my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] and I started working practically every day on the labor situation as it existed in our State at that time. Many times we consulted with the Department of Agriculture, even the Secretary of Agriculture himself. We pointed out to him time and again that if we expected to harvest crops or plant the crops to produce more food in our State, a program had to be worked out immediately under which additional labor could be brought to the farms. So to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] and myself this is no new program. Both of us are agriculturists, and long ago we had Mexican labor. We secured them, hired them, paid them off at the end of the season, long before we ever heard of the Farm Security Administration, which was supposed to give our people assistance in the way of farming.

The three counties—Kern, Tulare, and Kings—that together comprise the Tenth Congressional District of California in 1942 produced agricultural products valued at more than \$175,000,000.

These farm products came from a million acres of irrigated lands and 200,000 acres of nonirrigated lands—wheat and barley.

Forty varieties of fruits, 20 kinds of vegetables, 10 major field crops, and 7 kinds of grains are produced in commercial quantities. The value of livestock produced and sold and their products totaled more than \$45,000,000.

There is no season of the year when harvesting or planting or processing is not going on.

The planting and harvesting of these crops requires seasonal labor in great numbers for the most valuable of them are extremely perishable and when ready for harvest permit only a short period of time for gathering or they are lost.

In addition to irrigation water which these crops must have, the supply of labor with which to gather them in must be adequate, and now with the whole world on short rations it is inconceivable that either should be curtailed or left lacking. The bungling of the problem of getting farm labor last year was offset somewhat by a very long and favorable harvest season. However, the bungling and stupid handling of those in charge of the program for securing farm labor cannot and should not be condoned, for we have too much at stake.

The present bill might not do everything that is necessary but it is a long step forward in the right direction. We should get rid of the crackpots and desk farmers and make it possible for experienced and practical men to do the job that must be done if the Nation is not to go hungry.

I hold in my hand, Mr. Chairman, a total of more than 75 telegrams that I have received in my office in the last 2 days. They come from an agricultural district. They do not come from politicians. They represent the Grange, the Farm Bureau, individual farmers, chambers of commerce, all right in the heart of the Agricultural Belt, and all in favor of this legislation. How many of you Congressmen here represent an agricultural district that in 1942 produced more than \$175,000,000 worth of food and fiber, so essential to our war effort? Mr. Chairman, we need every dime that is in this present bill, to provide that adequate labor be brought in, to continue to produce food for health, and for the winning of the war, and I say to you that the Secretary of Agriculture is responsible for this bungling of the Farm Security Administration. If I had been Secretary of Agriculture, I would have fired the Farm Security Administration a long time ago, and I would not have waited until Congress had to boot them out. I say to you gentlemen, this is serious. This is no longer a matter of the Agriculture Department. It is the duty of Congress to see to it that food is produced for our boys on the firing line, and we should not let them down. Let us see that these boys are fed, and that the boys in the war plants are fed, and that maximum production is had for all. By passing this bill, it will be one of the issues that will go down in history as most essential in our war effort.

I hold in my hand here a transcript of the testimony of a man named Casey Abbott, a farmer from the State of Arizona. He appeared before the Senate Agricultural Committee, and what did he testify to? He pointed out some of the very things that I have told you about and I want to read from his statement, to show what the Farm Security Administration did in the way of providing labor in the State of Arizona. He said:

We found a large portion of these workers were unfit for any kind of labor, namely, persons in the last stages of tuberculosis, who were told that Arizona was a mecca for such diseases, and that if they could get out there, they might effect a cure, even if they could not work; that they would be given a free medical card and attention and otherwise be taken care of.

There were active cases of syphilis, confirmed alcoholics, and people choked up with asthma, who by their own admission, had not done a day's work in 2 years; women expecting to become mothers any minute, men over 70 years of age and jailbirds with long prison records, as well as old worn-out prostitutes.

That is what Mr. Abbott told the committee that the Farm Security Administration did for the State of Arizona.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] for 5 minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield the 5 minutes allotted to me to the gentleman from Illinois, so that he may have 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, perhaps at this stage of the proceedings it may be well to recapitulate the arguments that have been made for and against the present proposal. I think it is generally agreed that there is a critical food situation. It must be agreed that in the production of food you must have machinery, but that matter is not before us today and is not an issue at the moment. It is agreed that you must have feed and fertilizer, but that matter is not before us today. Many members of this House agree that you must have an adequate price for farm commodities, but that matter is not in controversy today. So we are dealing with the only other element that enters into the food picture, outside of the weather, and manifestly over the weather we have no authority or power, and that is the question of manpower. Therefore, let us confine the issue to the question of whether or not and to what extent we can effect a proposal here that will solve the agricultural manpower problem. There are certain areas of agreement, I think, insofar as I could ascertain from the discussion carried on both yesterday and today. The first one is that if we are going to do something, we are

reasonably unanimous at least that it ought to be done by the Extension Service in the Department of Agriculture rather than by the Farm Security Administration, which has been heretofore designated by the Secretary of Agriculture for that purpose. That matter is involved in the O'Neal proposal to substitute for the pending bill. He would restore this power to the Secretary of Agriculture with suitable language in the bill giving him authority to transfer funds not only to any bureau in the Department of Agriculture, but to any bureau or agency in the entire structure of Government.

Having had an opportunity since 1942 and having failed in the endeavor, I see no reason why the Congress should go over that path again. It should exercise its own responsibility, and instead of permitting the Secretary once more to designate the agency that has already failed, let the Congress then say today that it ought to be handled by Extension Service. We are agreed, then, I think in a fair way, that the Extension Service should handle this matter.

Secondly, I think there will be agreement with the Pace amendment, which will safeguard counties, so that employees cannot be taken out of a county if there is a shortage and transported to some other county. And we are agreed with the second provision in the Pace amendment that there should be some safeguarding of county labor. I shall go along with that amendment.

So if we are agreed on Extension Service and if we are reasonably agreed on the Pace amendment to safeguard the States and counties, then the only other controversy before us is the question of amount. The Secretary of Agriculture says he needs \$65,000,000. The committee in reporting this resolution says \$26,000,000 should suffice to do the job. Our friend, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, offers an amendment striking it down to \$12,000,000. The curious argument is that after all this is only a gesture. After all this is a piece of sheer futility. After all we are not going to accomplish anything. After all, where can you find any surplus labor today? If there is any merit in that argument, Mr. Chairman, then why vote any money at all? You might just as well strike the enacting clause. I cannot imagine anybody defending his position by saying that it is a futility, it is a gesture, it will be an abortive effort, and so instead of spending \$26,000,000 you will waste only \$12,000,000. There is no substance, nor sense, nor logic in that kind of argument. You would be in a far more consistent position by striking the enacting clause or by voting no money whatsoever. I am of the opinion that the effect of the effort that we shall here and now propose and enact, if it is enacted, should be implemented with sufficient funds to give the Extension Service a chance to do the job.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. In view of the fact that the gentleman's resolution—and he wrote the resolution—cuts down what

the Budget proposed from \$65,000,000 to \$26,000,000, how can he advance the argument which has just been suggested by him against a further reduction? Why did not the gentleman provide for the \$65,000,000 recommended by the Budget?

Mr. DIRKSEN. For the very good reason we feel there is a job to be done and it has been laid out on this proposal that the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] had mimeographed, and which you will find at the desk. There is a break-down and we sought to follow a consistent program. We do not believe we are going to spend \$26,000,000 on an absolute futility; yet the gentleman from Georgia was in the Well yesterday and threw up his hands and said, "It is just going to be a waste of money, so instead of wasting \$26,000,000 we will just waste \$12,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman with the greatest of grace and pleasure.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, I would be glad to see no money appropriated for a futile program, but I sought to secure a compromise. Has not the gentleman frequently adopted the position that this program will be futile, and if so, why does he want to appropriate \$26,000,000?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not an issue today as to what the gentleman from Illinois might have done heretofore. He is trying to deal realistically with the problem of agricultural manpower that is before us right now. I do not propose to see any red herring pulled across the trail.

Now, it has been stated there are some States that do not want any help. That may be, but I shall not be so provincial as to say that I am trying to legislate for the State of Illinois or the State of Wisconsin, or the State of West Virginia. This is a program that applies to the 48 States of the Union. You have different farming conditions in different States, and we are undertaking here and now to propose a pattern that will cover the 48 States of the Union.

They say there will be no results because nothing has been done in the price field. I remember speeches in the Well of this House when we were dealing with the Office of Price Administration, when Members stated repeatedly, in stentorian tones, that the 90 million or 120 million would be wasted because you could not curb inflation. But we voted the money. I remember when they argued here year after year that the \$1,400,000,000 that we spent on W. P. A. would not solve the unemployment problem; but we voted the money. So today it seems to be the better part of common sense on the part of Congress that in designating the Extension Service for this purpose, they be given sufficient funds with which to do the job. If they should fail, certainly the Congress will have discharged its responsibility.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Was not the original request—of which this bill is an abridg-



ment—for \$65,000,000, a part of which was to build a lot of camps for housing which are not regarded as needed? Do we not have enough housing by taking the camps now under the Farm Security and also the discarded C. C. C. camps, to provide the needed housing? Does not this bill seek maximum use of what we have without new housing?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That provision is in the pending resolution, that housing, insofar as needed, as determined by the Extension Service, will be utilized?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Apropos of the amount that may be necessary, I understood the gentleman to endorse the Pace amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. HOPE. Does not the gentleman think, if that amendment is adopted, the amount which will be necessary for the Extension Service to spend will be greatly reduced, because, in my judgment, no county agent, no State agricultural commissioner is going to affront the farmers of his State by permitting any agricultural labor to go out of that county or State?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The agricultural commissioners of the States can send any surplus labor that is developed, and it is very largely a matter of policy of transporting the laborer outside of the county.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOPE. I submit that the amendment should be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, appropriations and the amount of appropriations will not solve the farm-labor problem, just as they did not solve the problem of unemployment. The President of the United States allocated \$5,000,000 to provide for the solution of this problem for the past season.

The Tarver amendment proposes to allocate \$12,100,000, or twice the amount allocated by the President.

It is generally agreed that the program, under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, has not only been a failure, but it is thoroughly discredited. The pending bill would utilize the Extension Service, and I think that while the benefits may be doubtful, it is a vast improvement over the existing program. It would be almost tragic to substitute the O'Neal bill for the pending measure, for it perpetuates a program that is thoroughly discredited.

The purpose of this bill is to provide and distribute labor. Labor is permanent; labor is seasonal. Labor does not go from one farm to another, or from a farm in one State to another farm in another State. It goes into industry because industry is offering better advantages and higher wages. The employment agencies often recruit for industries, but under the Extension Service they must not further deplete farm labor.

I am very doubtful about the provisions of this bill, except as this bill under the administration of the Extension Service may succeed in bringing in Mexican and West Indies labor. There is a scarcity of labor, both seasonal and permanent, in every State in the Union. We might as well face the facts. The principal source of any additional labor will be from Mexico or the West Indies. The appropriation of \$12,100,000, twice the amount allocated by the President, will give to the Extension Service an opportunity to try this matter out and if the amount is not sufficient, that Service can come back to the Congress and in another appropriation bill ask for an additional amount of money.

What agency of the Government or what witness before the committee that reported this bill ever stated that \$26,100,000 would solve this problem? Let us be reasonable about this matter. We have a farm-labor problem. Many factors enter into it. We are discussing one, and that is the matter of supplying and distributing labor, and when the industries and the Selective Service have gotten the farm workers, we have got to do what the manufacturers of New England did following the War between the States. They imported foreign labor. We can give the Extension Service an opportunity to solve this problem by adopting reasonable and sound measures for the importation of labor that may be available in the nearby countries. Now, I would like to say that if the Extension Service will use the same good, common sense that the Southern cotton farmers in Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas used in the First World War, when in Ford trucks they went across the border into Mexico, selected desirable laborers, brought them back, paid a head charge, and returned the laborers to their homes after the crops had been harvested. Treating the laborers fairly, I think, the Extension Service can aid in solving the problem.

In executing the terms of the pending bill there should be no movement either from one county to another or from one State to another that results in an under-supply of farm labor in the county or the State from which the labor is removed. Farms have been depleted by the high wages of industry and by the selective service. They must not be further depleted by the labor being carried from one county to another or from one State to another. There should be provision for clearance with appropriate county and State authorities so that county and State needs will not be jeopardized by either seasonal or permanent labor being transported from one county to another or from one State to another. The Pace amendment is imperative. I am glad that the committee in charge has agreed to accept the Pace amendment. It makes the pending bill much more satisfactory.

Both agriculture and industry look more and more to the Government to solve their problems. I believe that farmers themselves could supply the labor needed if they were permitted to bring it in for seasonal purposes from

Mexico and from the outlying West Indies. The matter could be handled by the Extension Service under contract with farmers to return the labor to the border or to the port after they had completed their work. The need is for more labor. It must be supplied by importing it from other countries or by reasonable transportation within the States from one State to another with the definite assurance that the labor will be returned to the State from which it was moved. Provision could be made within the State for the return of the labor that is transported from one county to another to the county from which it came. The pending bill if properly administered should aid in the solution of the farm-labor problem. If farmers are disappointed and if the program fails, the Extension Service will suffer irreparable loss.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Delegate from Hawaii [Mr. FARRINGTON] is recognized.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be permitted to read the amendment I have offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will informally report the amendment to be offered by the Delegate from Hawaii.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARRINGTON, Delegate from Hawaii:

On page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out the words "and Puerto Rico."

On page 2, line 15, strike out the words "and Puerto Rico."

On page 5, line 15, after the word "act", insert the following: "Provided further, That the term 'States' or 'State' as used herein, include Puerto Rico and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska."

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to extend the provisions of House Joint Resolution 96 to the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska. The inclusion of Alaska is made at the request of Delegate ANTHONY J. DIMOND, of that Territory.

The resolution as reported by the committee provides that the funds appropriated shall "be expended under the supervision and direction of the Agricultural Extension Service of the United States Department of Agriculture in cooperation with the agricultural services of the land-grant colleges in the respective States and in Puerto Rico."

So far as I know, there are no plans to extend this service to the Territory of Hawaii. I am not in a position to say that this is necessary or advisable at the present time. This does not mean, however, that the eventuality may not develop. I think it is an error, therefore, to pass this legislation limiting it to the States and Puerto Rico, particularly in view of the important position of Hawaii in the scheme of national defense.

Moreover, the Territory of Hawaii asks for treatment on the basis of equality with the States in all legislation of this kind. This is not only a matter of simple justice. It is sound public policy.

The Territory of Hawaii has, for all practical purposes, carried all the responsibility of a State for almost 40

years. The people of the islands contribute to the Federal Treasury on the same basis as a State, and are prepared to carry all the responsibilities of the citizens of the States. The war has given new emphasis to these responsibilities.

The record of the civilian population, constituting some half million people, since the infamous attack of December 7, 1941, amply justifies the confidence which has been reposed in them and vindicates the generous policy of the Federal Government in dealing with this Territory.

The attitude of the people of the islands toward the many Federal agencies, when called upon to contribute to the development of the islands as a defensive and offensive base, has been one of wholehearted cooperation. The record of Hawaii's civil population since the outbreak of war deserves all the praise that it has won from civil and military leaders alike.

I am sure, therefore, that no effort should be lost to strengthen any Federal agency that may be called upon to function in this area so vital to the entire country.

I think, therefore, that the extension of the measure, such as that now before the committee, to the islands, while in itself may appear to be a small matter, is of real importance to national defense as well as the development of sound national policy in dealing with the territories.

I have conferred with the chairman of the committee on this amendment and he has expressed himself as agreeable to the change. I ask, therefore, that it be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, there are one or two things I want to say about this matter. I have listened as attentively as I could to the debate of the last 2 days and at least two or three issues seem to be in the minds of the Members. First, do we provide in this bill too much money?

As to that, I only want to say I do not think there is anybody on this floor who can accurately measure the amount of money that can be intelligently spent. We have on the Deficiency Committee, which reported this bill, the chairman of every subcommittee in the Appropriations Committee, and I trust their judgment. Their action is further reviewed by the entire Appropriations Committee, consisting of 43 members.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman's statement is inaccurate. We do not have the chairman of every subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee on the Deficiency Committee.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman is correct and my statement was wrong. I should have said that the majority members on that committee are chairmen of subcommittees and that it embraces a majority of all subcommittee

chairmen. These men have studied the problem. The matter was referred to the Appropriations Committee, 43 members, that represent nearly one-tenth of the membership of this House. They have studied it as carefully as they know how and they have reported this bill out. I do not think they say it is the final or the last word, but they have tried hard to bring you a good bill and they feel that \$26,000,000 is a fair figure.

Let me say in reply to the claim that the money is going to be frittered away that we surely have tried to establish checks and balances to keep that from happening. We have appointed a committee of auditors under the Appropriations Committee, the function of which is to go out and see to it that the money is properly spent. I believe we have full justification to say that this bill will work.

Secondly, another question comes up under the O'Neal amendment as to whether we have reached out and taken the right agency to handle this, whether we could handle it by the extension agents supplemented by the Extension Service, as the bill provides, and I support, or whether we should handle it through the Farm Security Administration. I am not here to criticize the Farm Security Administration program of handling those affairs which deal with the placing of people on farms or the financial aid to small farmers. But I do question what they have done in employment. I questioned yesterday what they have done as an employment agency, and my reason is this: We have tried to establish in this country a system of Nation-wide free employment agencies under the United States Employment Service. Any time you set up a separate agency to handle farm labor or a separate agency to handle seamen's labor or shipbuilding labor, or anything else, you tear down the principle of a Nation-wide free employment service. You should not do that. There should be a Nation-wide employment service working which keeps track of labor shortages and surpluses.

Under the appropriation bill as it stands, Resolution 96, it will be possible for the Extension Service to survey the field locally, then call upon the Nation-wide service of the United States Employment Service to exchange surplus labor if any exists in any other parts of the country. I think you gentlemen who represent labor districts should remember that everything we pass here should try to build up over this country a good Nation-wide employment service and should not be broken down to farm sections or shipbuilding sections or any other kind of sections.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true with respect to the amount authorized or appropriated in this bill, that practically all of it is for transportation and subsistence and if they do not bring the labor in, the money is not spent?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman is correct. If the labor is not brought in, then the great proportion of

the money is not spent. Let me bring this picture to you:

If you establish two separate agencies, one the United States Employment Service recruiting industrial labor which it is now doing and the other the Farm Security Administration recruiting farm labor, as it has done, you could easily have in this country the spectacle of people standing on the street corners, the Employment Service bidding for labor for industry and the Farm Security group bidding for farm labor. They would bid up labor prices and make it impossible for the farmers of this country to obtain labor. Farmers cannot bid against industrial machines, and you must not force them to. You have got to let the United States Employment Service survey the whole field and see where it can most advantageously allot labor.

Finally, I want to ask whether it can be effective. I do know that it can be applied, for instance, to the border States. The men from California, Texas, Arizona, and New Mexico have urged that it will give Nation-wide relief and we ought at least to give it a trial. I urge you to support the committee bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah, [Mr. GRANGER].

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be used by the gentleman from Georgia, [Mr. TARVER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement made by the gentleman who preceded me as to the manner in which this estimate has been handled and as to its having been considered by the subcommittee upon which he stated was every chairman of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee, I desire to make this short additional statement: This estimate under ordinary procedure which has been followed in connection with appropriations or estimates for appropriations for other departments of the Government, would have normally been referred to the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. You will recall that less than 2 weeks ago the gentleman from California, chairman of the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations, brought before the House a deficiency estimate for the Navy Department which had been considered by the Subcommittee on Naval Appropriations and had been referred by the chairman of the full committee to that subcommittee for attention.

This estimate is for expenditure in the main during the next fiscal year, but it was not referred to the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations for consideration, although that subcommittee has given a great deal of time to the investigation of the problems which are sought to be dealt with by this appropriation. I am not particularly jealous of the jurisdiction of the subcommittee of which I happen to be



chairman. I do not happen to be a member of the deficiency subcommittee, although I was invited to attend some of its sessions, and did attend, as did other members of my subcommittee; but I submit that if a question affecting deficiency appropriations for the Navy Department should be referred to the Naval Subcommittee on Appropriations, then estimates of this type having to do with agriculture and the operations of the Department of Agriculture should be referred to the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations.

If that had been done this bill would not be before you today in the shape it is. Four of the seven members of the Agriculture Subcommittee voted in support of my motion in the full committee to cut down the appropriation from \$26,100,000 to \$12,100,000. So my amendment represents the judgment as expressed in the full committee of a majority of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations. I thought you ought to have that information for whatever it might be worth.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman will recall as will other members of the committee—I do not believe a single speaker in the 2 days that we have been considering this bill has held out the thought or hope that any very immediate or quickly beneficial results could come from this legislation. If this be true, does not the gentleman feel that if we give the Extension Service and the Employment Service \$12,000,000 now that they could go on with the work and if they really met the need and can show results, Congress still being in session, they could show their need and receive an additional appropriation?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman I believe knows my unfaltering interest in agriculture. If I felt that \$26,000,000 or \$65,000,000 could be advantageously used I should be in favor of appropriating it. I think this is all the money, and more money, in fact, \$12,100,000, than they will have any opportunity of spending to good advantage in the near future; and as the gentleman says, Congress, if additional need can be shown, can make additional appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] quoted Aristotle on mathematics. I wish to quote a philosopher of a more modern day. Thomas Jefferson, the wisest political philosopher this country ever saw, said:

Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread.

It seems to me we have about reached that time now, or we are rapidly approaching it.

I make the prediction that the time will come, if it has not already arrived,

when the American farmers will curse the Congressman who voted to place on the statute books these laws that permit bureaucrats who know nothing about agriculture to try to run the farms of this country.

I make the prediction that the time is not far distant when members of organized labor, as well as the rest of the American people, will curse the Congressmen who voted to pass the wage and hour law, and those other measures that seemed to give labor some temporary advantages, but which in the long run puts labor at the mercy of its worst enemies.

You simply cannot improve on the Constitution of the United States in the protection it provides for all our people; nor can you reverse the laws of nature, or destroy the immutable laws of economics, by an ill considered act of Congress or an irrational edict of the labor board.

I make the prediction that the time is not far distant, if it has not already arrived, when the American people will curse the Members of Congress who voted to impose upon them this price-fixing, rationing system, and other unnecessary regimentations that are today paralyzing every activity and hampering our war efforts.

If we would repeal those laws today and go back to the same policies we followed in the First World War, we would not only produce all the people of this country need, but we would have unity in our war efforts.

Then when we talked about democracy, which means real representative government, with freedom and liberty, we would not be merely keeping the word of promise to the ear and breaking it to the hope.

Today, the people are being needed to death by alien-minded bureaucrats. By going back to the sane American system, we would have enough to go around. You would not have black markets all over the country, and you would not have the money changers and their friends trying to hold the prices of the farmers' products down below the cost of production at a time when we have the greatest inflation in the amount of money per capita in circulation ever known in all the history of this Nation.

Farm prices, when unrestricted, are measured by the volume of the Nation's currency multiplied by the velocity of its circulation.

At the close of the last war we had \$53.21 per capita in circulation, with a very high velocity of circulation. The result was that cotton went to 35 or 40 cents a pound and wheat to \$2.50 a bushel, with other prices in proportion. The result was the farmers produced everything we needed.

Today we have \$114.50 per capita in circulation, with the highest velocity of circulation ever known, and yet cotton is only about 19½ cents a pound and wheat is about \$1.35 a bushel.

If the Government would stop trying to restrict farm prices, but let them rise to their normal levels, and cease these attempts to unnecessarily regiment and regulate the people who till the soil, they

would produce all the raw materials necessary for food and clothing for us and our allies, and we would have unity and cooperation instead of division and confusion.

Let the farmers run their own farms, stop stripping them of their labor, and while their sons are fighting the Nation's battles on every front in the world their people back at home will produce the raw materials to feed and clothe the world.

But, as Thomas Jefferson said, whenever Washington can tell the farmers when to sow and when to reap, the Nation will want bread.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I do not pose as a farm expert. I am not. I do represent the largest agricultural area in the State of Massachusetts, with many fine farmers in my district. They prefer, apparently, to have their direction come from the county extension service.

Also, Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied with this bill, but it is a beginning of a plan. Eventually, we should have a more carefully thought-out plan. I believe it should all be administered by one department. And without a carefully thought-out organization to insure to farmers labor on their farms, labor that they can count upon, otherwise the measure cannot succeed.

I have always felt that agriculture should be considered an essential war measure. I have been greatly disturbed that no efficient farm plan has been started to insure complete farm production. We must feed our people, and we are likely to have to feed many of the people of Europe, in my opinion. We will have to use trained women on the farms. I introduced a bill for that purpose which would provide for a voluntary war farm corps of women. I saw yesterday the tragic and pitiful pictures made and described by Dr. Therise Bonney of the starving children of Europe. I never will forget those so long as I live. It makes me all the more anxious that agriculture should progress at a rapid rate in our own country. Great agricultural production immediately is imperative.

May I say also that importing labor from other countries will mean feeding more mouths. I am not trying to keep the farmers from having their labor—far from it—but every laborer who comes into this country should be examined to find out whether or not he is loyal, whether or not he is a real Mexican. Many Nazis can come in under the guise of being Mexican labor. Under the laws of Mexico, refugees can become citizens very quickly, as you all know. Members have stated on the floor that this labor is to be returned to Mexico after seasonal work is finished in the United States. That should be done.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PLOESER. I wish to make it clear to the Committee, without having any time after the vote on the Tarver amendment, that I have at the Clerk's desk an amendment which will go further than the Tarver amendment in that it reduces the amount of money to be allotted to the Agricultural Extension Service to \$6,025,000, and eliminates entirely the amount of money to be allotted to the United States Employment Service. This would bring the resolution in line with the thinking of a great many Members of the House in that we would allot only that amount of money considered a minimum necessity for the experiment of trying the Extension Service.

Because the amendment strikes out a large part of the language on page 3 of the bill, it of course is not eligible as a substitute to the Tarver amendment, but it is at the Clerk's desk, and immediately after we have voted on the Tarver amendment I intend to ask for the consideration of this amendment.

I explain again that it cuts the amount to \$6,025,000. It leaves only that bare amount in the bill for the minimum necessities of the Extension Service to experiment where all else has apparently failed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. LAMBERTSON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I ask to be recognized for debate, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The name of the gentleman from Kansas was included in the list handed to him by the Clerk of Members desiring recognition. The Chair called the name of the gentleman some time ago. The Chair has gone down the list, in an effort to be fair to everyone. The Chair regrets to inform the gentleman that all time has now been consumed except the final 10 minutes which, under agreement of the House, is to be divided between the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, your committee was presented with an estimate of \$65,000,000. A part of that \$65,000,000 was \$6,000,000 for the Extension Service in the States to operate the recruitment, training, and placement program of farm workers within the States. That item is included in this bill. The rest of that item as it was brought to us was represented to be for the Farm Security Administration expense. In view of the operations of that organization, and their failure to function, to produce results in any possible way, the committee felt that they did not present a proposition that was possible. We recognized the very seriousness of this farm situation and the need for food. Unless we have that food, we are going to be seriously handicapped in our war efforts. The \$6,000,000 for the recruitment, training, and placement of farm workers within the States, to be allocated to the Extension Service will, I know, produce very substantial results. I

know how that set-up is organized. I know that it is already working at it as far as it can, and that it needs extra money in my territory. The other items are items to bring people in from outside the county, and for the temporary housing of farm labor that is brought in. It has been brought into my own territory in the last 3 or 4 years, in quite substantial number, and it is needed there. We were unable to find an agency until the Extension Service came before us that would undertake the job of handling this outside labor, outside the State and outside the country, that we could trust. The Extension Service came before us and their executive committee went to work upon it and laid out this program whereby we could cut the estimate from \$65,000,000 to \$26,000,000, and still do the job. I see what troubles the people in California, in New Mexico, Arizona, and Texas. I know what trouble my own people are in in the vegetable industry. It is absolutely impossible to take care of it the way it is done. I felt that we had to do something. The committee felt that way. The Director of the Extension Service, Dr. Simons, of Cornell University, New York, and Mr. Ramsauer, of Ohio, the director there, came before us and presented this estimate. This break-down that I have here is available for anybody who wants it at the Clerk's desk. They also presented a resolution of their executive committee after long consideration of 2 or 3 days, setting up the program and saying they were ready to tackle the job. I believe we ought to let them tackle it. I do not believe that we ought to cut the money down so that they cannot do a job. I do not want them to say that the Congress is to blame for not giving them money, for their not having enough force to work, and I want to see the job done.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, before I take the floor I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of this debate all amendments that have been sent to the desk for notice and all others coming up in the course of the consideration of the bill shall be considered, without further discussion, seriatim in order in which presented.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we are to decide here in the next few minutes a question which is today arousing apprehension on every farm and at every dinner table in America. Already there is a more alarming shortage of food throughout the country than distributors in touch with the situation care to acknowledge. You cannot, this afternoon, go into the average food shop of any city in the Nation and buy everything you want to eat, and the situation grows increasingly and progressively worse as time goes by. The situation cannot be remedied without increased production on the farm. To increase production we must have labor, and farm labor cannot be secured unless we do something about it here this after-

noon. Now the question is, Do you want to do anything? Do you want to make any effort to solve this problem in which is involved, not only the question of sufficient food for the average family but the winning of the war? If you do, it must be done here and now.

There are in the last analysis only two issues before us in this bill. First, will you adopt the method recommended by the committee and, second, will you provide enough money to do the job?

It is just as inconsistent, Mr. Chairman, to send to the front the best machine gun in the world, and not send with it sufficient ammunition to keep it firing, as it is to adopt the plan agreed upon here today, and not give them sufficient money with which to put it into effect. We have already cut this estimate down from \$65,000,000 to \$26,000,000. That is the irreducible minimum if our purpose is to provide any farm labor at all. You can buy \$26,000,000 worth of labor or you can buy \$12,000,000 worth of labor. Which do you want to give the farmers? Which do you think the farmers want? Which do you think the consumers want the farmers to have? What is really needed? Do they need \$26,000,000 worth of labor on the farms of America or do they need \$12,000,000 worth of labor? I do not have to tell you that they need not only \$26,000,000 worth of labor but that they need a billion dollars worth of labor if it could be supplied—and that if available, it would provide not only needed food but would help to win this war and would help to shorten the war.

Mr. Chairman, the committee which reported this bill is not only the largest committee but it is one of the most carefully selected committees of the House. It is composed of 43 members, all of them veterans. They have given this bill exceptional consideration. The estimate came up from the Budget along with the estimates for the deficiency bill and it was our intention to include it as a part of that bill. But when we got into it we found it affected matters of such importance and involved so many controversial questions that we had to defer it in order to give it further study and reported out and passed the deficiency bill without it. We have had it under consideration ever since and after the most painstaking deliberation we submit this solution. It may not be perfect but it is the composite product of the judgment and experience of the 43 men and is the best we can do. We offer it to you as the most practical approach to the problem we have been able to devise. The report is not unanimous but it was approved by an overwhelming majority of the members of the committee.

Time is short. Something must be done and done now. The question you are now voting on is whether you will give enough and give it in time or whether you will give too little and too late.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

All time has expired.

The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].



Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again reported.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mr. TARVER, as follows:

On page 2, line 18, after the words "the sum of", strike out "\$26,100,000" and insert "\$12,100,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were ayes 86 and noes 111.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. TARVER and Mr. CANNON of Missouri to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 104, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: On page 4, line 7, after the colon following the word "services", insert "Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be expended for the transportation of any worker from the county where he resides or is working to a place of employment outside of such county without the prior consent in writing of the county extension agent of such county; or for the transportation of any worker outside of the limits of the State where he resides or is working without the prior consent in writing of the commissioner of agriculture for such State, or other official who performs similar functions for such State."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the amendment is acceptable to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment, which is at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: On page 5, line 7, after the word "impose", insert "unreasonable."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FLOESER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair state that pursuant to a unanimous consent request by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], amendments are

being taken up in the order in which they were offered.

The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. FLOESER].

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLOESER: On page 2, line 18, after the word "of", strike out "\$26,100,000" and insert "\$6,025,000"; and in line 19 strike out "\$100,000" and insert "\$25,000"; and in line 21 strike out "\$13,500,000" and insert "\$6,000,000"; and on page 3, line 4, strike out all of line 4 after the semicolon and all of lines 5 to 19 and all of line 20, to the word "the" in that line.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which is at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULMER: On page 5, after line 14, insert the following:

"Sec. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, every individual who was regularly engaged in an agricultural occupation or endeavor in any capacity in connection with the production of any agricultural commodity during a major part of the calendar year 1942, and who, on the date of enactment of this joint resolution or on the date thereafter on which such individual receives orders to report for induction into the land or naval forces of the United States, is regularly engaged in any capacity in connection with the production of any agricultural commodity shall be deferred from training and service under such act until January 1, 1944, or until the date on which such individual ceases to be regularly engaged in any capacity in connection with the production of any such commodity, whichever first occurs. As used in the foregoing sentence the term 'production of any agricultural commodity' includes the raising, feeding, caring for, and management of any dairy animals or other livestock or poultry."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane to this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] makes the point of order that the amendment is not germane to this bill. Does the gentleman from South Carolina desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. House Joint Resolution 96 provides an appropriation for supplying and distributing farm labor. The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina in effect amends the Selective Training and Service Act by providing for certain deferments. Legislation affecting the Draft Act automatically comes under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Military Affairs, not the Committee on Appropriations or the Committee on Agriculture. Therefore, in the opinion of the Chair, the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER] is not germane to the pending resolution, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARRINGTON:

Page 2, lines 1 and 2, strike out the words "and in Puerto Rico."

Page 2, line 15, strike out the words "and Puerto Rico."

Page 5, line 14, after the word "Act", insert "Provided further, That the term 'States' or 'State' as used herein, includes Puerto Rico and the Territories of Hawaii and Alaska."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the committee has no objection to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Ohio: On page 5, before the period in line 14, insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That no part of the funds herein appropriated nor any of the funds hitherto appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used directly or indirectly to compel any person to submit involuntarily to transportation, placement, or service as an agricultural worker."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SMITH of Ohio), there were—ayes 54, noes 106.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL].

The amendment offered by Mr. O'NEAL follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'NEAL: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

"That for expenses necessary for the formulation, development, and execution, under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and either independently or in cooperation with individuals or agencies, public or private, of a plan to assist in providing an adequate supply and distribution of labor, including sharecroppers and tenants (including aliens), for the production of agricultural commodities essential to the prosecution of the war, including (1) recruiting, placement, and transportation of such labor within the continental United States and elsewhere, including transportation of their families and household effects; (2) furnishing, by loans, grants, or otherwise, of medical services, training, subsistence, and shelter; (3) construction or lease and operation of labor supply centers and other necessary facilities and services; (4) employment of persons (including aliens) and organizations, by contract or otherwise, at the seat of government and elsewhere; (5) purchase, exchange, operation, and maintenance of passenger-carrying vehicles; (6) printing and binding; (7) acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; and (8) travel expenses of persons employed in administrative, supervisory, or facilitating capacities from a foreign country to the United States and return, including such expenses to first-duty stations; there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of

\$26,000,000, to remain available until December 31, 1943: *Provided*, That expenditures may be made hereunder without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes: *Provided further*, That whenever labor shall be furnished hereunder to any other agency, public or private, or individual, this appropriation shall be reimbursed for expenditures on account of wages paid to such labor and other expenditures in connection therewith to the extent which the Secretary may determine to be practicable: *Provided further*, That effective July 1, 1943, notwithstanding section 3 of the act of June 29, 1936 (40 U. S. C. 433), receipts derived for the account of the United States from the use and occupancy of labor supply centers, including camps and facilities heretofore used by or under the control of the Farm Security Administration, shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That not less than \$6,000,000 of the appropriation herein shall be allocated for use by or under the direction of the Extension Service and transfers may be made, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, from \$20,000,000 of this appropriation to any bureau or office of the Department of Agriculture, or to any other agency of the Government, which is assigned functions in connection herewith, in addition to the transfers authorized by the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Acts for the fiscal years 1943 and 1944: *Provided further*, That any payments made by the United States or private employers to aliens under this program shall not be subject to deduction or withholding under section 143 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code: *Provided further*, That no part of the appropriation herein made nor any of the funds heretofore appropriated or made available to the Secretary of Agriculture for the recruitment, transportation, and placement of farm labor shall be used directly or indirectly to fix, regulate, or impose minimum wages or housing standards, to regulate hours of work, or to impose or enforce collective-bargaining requirements or union membership with respect to any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of sections 3 (f), 7 (c), and 13 (a) (10) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, or any agricultural labor exempted under the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act."

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. O'NEAL) there were—ayes 28, noes 154.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SIKES, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 96, making an appropriation to assist in providing a supply and distribution of farm labor for the calendar year 1943, directed him to report the resolution back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the resolution as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LAMBERTSON moves to recommit the resolution to the Committee on Appropriations with directions to report the same back forthwith with amendments as follows:

On page 2, line 18, strike out "\$26,100,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$12,100,000."

On page 2, line 21, strike out "\$13,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,000,000."

On page 3, line 4, strike out "\$12,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$6,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. As I understand it this is the substance of the Tarver amendments, is it not?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no knowledge as to that.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. On the motion to recommit, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HOFFMAN) there were—ayes 195, noes 81.

So the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the bill may have 5 days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the Private Calendar will be called.

The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

#### ARTHUR A. SCHIPKE

The Clerk called the first bill, S. 171, for the relief of Arthur A. Schipke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Arthur A. Schipke, of Meriden, Conn., the sum of \$148.15, in full satisfaction of his claim

against the United States for property damage resulting from a collision between his automobile and a Department of Agriculture truck in Union, Conn., on March 10, 1939: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DR. PAUL ROGER ZAHLMANN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 173, for the relief of Dr. Paul Roger Zahlmann.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST and Mr. MADDEN objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

#### MRS. ERNESTINE FUSELIER SIGLER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 405, for the relief of Mrs. Ernestine Fuselier Sigler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Ernestine Fuselier Sigler, of Oberlin, La., the sum of \$1,200, in full settlement of all her claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by her and for expenses incurred as the result of an accident, involving an Army truck engaged in Third Army maneuvers on September 25, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### VODIE JACKSON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 517, for the relief of Vodie Jackson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Vodie Jackson, of Obion County, Tenn. (post office address, Fulton, Ky.), the sum of \$3,686, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries and property damage sustained by him when his wagon, in which he was riding, was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck near Fulton, Ky., on October 18, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the con-



trary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT T. GROOM, DAISY GROOM, AND MARGARET GROOM TURPIN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 518, for the relief of Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, and Margaret Groom Turpin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert T. Groom, Daisy Groom, his wife, and Margaret Groom Turpin, his daughter, all of Murfreesboro, Tenn., the respective sums hereinafter specified in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States arising out of a collision which occurred near Murfreesboro, Tenn., on October 21, 1941, when an automobile driven by Robert H. Pate, a United States mail carrier, ran into the automobile of the said Robert T. Groom: To the said Robert T. Groom, \$952 as compensation for property damage and other damages sustained by him; to the said Daisy Groom, \$4,000 as compensation for all damages, including hospitalization, suffered by her; and to the said Margaret Groom Turpin, \$3,500 as compensation for all damages, including hospitalization, suffered by her: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOLINROSS CHEMICAL CO., INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 243, conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Bolinross Chemical Co., Inc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. PRIEST objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MRS. C. A. LEE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 553, for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Lee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. C. A. Lee, of Ivy, Tenn., administratrix of the estate of her deceased son, Ross Lee, the sum of \$10,000. Such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for all loss and damages sustained by her on account of injuries sustained by the

death of said Ross Lee, who was fatally injured in an accident by a United States owned truck (Civilian Conservation Corps) on October 9, 1937, between Reliance and Ivy, Tenn.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, after "of," strike out the remainder of line 7 and all down to and including "Tennessee" in line 2 on page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$5,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for, and expenses incident to, the death of the said Ross Lee, who was killed by a United States Civilian Conservation Corps truck, driven by Archie Carroll, an enrollee, between Reliance and Ivy, Tenn., on October 9, 1937."

Page 2, after line 19, insert the following:

"Sec. 2. Payment shall not be made until the above named claimant has released all claims and judgments against the said Archie Carroll, in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mrs. C. A. Lee, administratrix of the estate of Ross Lee, deceased."

FRANK BORAH

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1081, for the relief of Frank Borah.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,371.30 to Frank Borah, of Philadelphia, Pa., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries suffered as a result of an accident involving an Army truck at Logan and Greene Streets, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa. on January 29, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 per cent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CHARLES J. BAIR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1238, for the relief of Mrs. Charles J. Bair.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Charles J. Bair, of Weslaco, Tex., the sum of \$5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained by the said Mrs. Charles J. Bair on account of the death of her son John Bair, who was killed in an automobile accident while en route to attend the citizens' military training camp, at Camp Bullis, Tex., on July 9, 1940.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the period and the remainder of line 6 and all of lines 7, 8, and 9 down to and including the word "Bair", and insert in lieu thereof "in full settlement of all claims against the United States."

Page 2, line 3, after "1940", insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE HENRY BARTOLE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1315, for the relief of George Henry Bartole.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George Henry Bartole, San Diego, Calif., the sum of \$585. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said George Henry Bartole against the United States on account of personal injuries and property damage sustained on May 3, 1942, when his automobile in which he was riding was struck on United States Highway No. 101, near San Clemente, Calif., by a United States Marine Corps jeep.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the period and the remainder of the line and the word "be", on line 7, and insert "and to Vernon Wayne Tennyson, San Diego, Calif., the sum of \$653."

Line 8, strike out "of the said George Henry Bartole."

Line 11, strike out "his" and insert "the" and strike out "he was" and insert "they were."

Page 2, at the end of the bill insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess

of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of George Henry Bartole and Vernon Wayne Tennyson."

COHEN, GOLDMAN & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1413, for the relief of Cohen, Goldman, & Co., Inc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALLECK, Mr. MOTT, Mr. PRIEST, and Mr. BUFFETT objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

MORTON FIEDLER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1522, for the relief of Morton Fiedler.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Morton Fiedler, of Pittsburgh, Pa., the sum of \$219.30, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property damage sustained when the automobile he was driving was struck by a United States Army truck on United States Highway No. 30, near Pittsburgh, Pa., on January 1, 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "30" and insert "22."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARTHUR G. KLEIN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1792) for the relief of Arthur G. Klein.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That Arthur G. Klein is relieved of all liability to the United States to refund to the United States the amount paid to him as an attorney in the New York regional office of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the period from July 9, 1941, to July 31, 1941, inclusive. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any disbursing officer of the United States the

said Arthur G. Klein shall be considered to have been in the employ of the Securities and Exchange Commission during such period and legally entitled to compensation for such period, and no officer or employee, or former officer or employee, of the United States shall be liable to the United States for the payment of the amount paid to the said Arthur G. Klein as compensation for such period.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HAROLD BYRNE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1814) for the relief of Harold Byrne.

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. PRIEST objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

LUCIA HUMBLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1838) for the relief of Lucia Humble.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lucia Humble, of Washington, D. C., the sum of \$125.65, in full settlement of her claim against the Government of the United States as reimbursement of the amount heretofore paid by her under contract No. J5-PB-580 with the Procurement Division, Treasury Department, on the purchase price of certain abandoned Government property sold to her at public auction: *Provided,* That the said Lucia Humble shall be relieved of any additional payments which may be due or become due under the terms of the aforesaid contract.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 7, strike out "her claims" and insert in lieu thereof "all claims."

Line 9, strike out the letter "J" and insert in lieu thereof the letter "T."

Line 10, after the word "Department", strike out "on the purchase price of certain abandoned Government property sold to her at public auction" and insert in lieu thereof "accepted on March 14, 1939, for the purchase of the Fenwick Island light station, Sussex County, Del."

Add at the end of the bill: "*Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TED VAUGHAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1845) for the relief of the estate of Ted Vaughan, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized

and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Ted Vaughan, deceased, of Nashville, Tenn., the sum of \$5,000, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for the death of the said Ted Vaughan, member of the Secret Service of the United States, who died on the 8th day of November 1940, at or near South Pittsburgh, Marion County, Tenn., on United States Highway No. 41, of fatal injuries incurred in an automobile collision, wherein the said Ted Vaughan was in nowise at fault, and while he was acting in line of duty on a mission for the United States of America: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT P. SICK

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1874) for the relief of Robert P. Sick.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert P. Sick, of Los Angeles, Calif., the sum of \$1,500 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for damages for personal injuries sustained by him as a result of falling into an open ditch on the grounds of the Veterans' Administration facility at Los Angeles, Calif., on April 7, 1939, during the period of time he was receiving medical treatment at such facility: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "his claim" and insert "all claims."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CARL SWANSON AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1875) for the relief of Carl Swanson, Geraldine Cecelia Swanson, a minor, and Almer Swanson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Carl Swanson, of Mason City, Iowa, the sum of \$3,000, in full settlement of all claims against



the United States for the death of his son, Merle Swanson, resulting when an automobile, driven by said Merle Swanson, was involved in a collision with a Works Progress Administration truck; and to the legal guardian of Geraldine Cecelia Swanson, a minor, of Mason City, Iowa, the sum of \$2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by her when an automobile, in which she was riding, was involved in a collision with a Works Progress Administration truck; and to Almer Swanson, of Mason City, Iowa, the sum of \$300, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damage to the automobile, of which she was the owner, involved in a collision with a Works Progress Administration truck, on county Z road, about a mile west of Rock Falls, Iowa, on October 14, 1936: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE H. CROW

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1893) for the relief of George H. Crow.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That notwithstanding the provisions and limitations of sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, the United States Employees' Compensation Commission be, and the same is hereby, authorized and directed to receive and consider, when filed, the claim of George H. Crow, of Salt Lake City, Utah, for disability alleged to have been incurred by him when an injury was sustained by him in line of duty while serving the United States Government at Salt Lake City, Utah, which impaired the use of his eyes and later required an operation to restore his vision: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 1 year after the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

M. L. LEOPOLD ROSENBERG

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 772) for the relief of M. L. Leopold Rosenberg, and his wife, Lisa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of M. L. Leopold Rosenberg, and his wife, Lisa, as of September 4, 1939, the date on which they were admitted temporarily to the United States, if they are found to be admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws, other than those relating to quotas. Upon the enactment of this act, the

Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the Rumanian quota of the first year that said Rumanian quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH NATHANIEL GOWNDER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1225) for the relief of Joseph Nathaniel Gownder.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Joseph Nathaniel Gownder as of April 22, 1922, the date on which he was admitted to the United States as a seaman.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REV. JULIUS PAAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1467) to record the lawful admission to the United States for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Rev. Julius Paal, who entered the United States at New York on October 5, 1937, and that he shall, for all purposes under the immigration and naturalization laws, be deemed to have been lawfully admitted as an immigrant for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall direct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Hungarian quota for the first year said Hungarian quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES W. KELLY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 401) for the relief of James W. Kelly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James W. Kelly, of Anchorage, Alaska, the sum of \$271.50, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for the loss of his personal effects in the fire which destroyed a building owned and operated by the Alaska Railroad, at Healy, Alaska, on May 9, 1941, while he was employed by the General Land Office as a fire-patrol guard in its Alaskan Fire Control Service: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOUGLAS R. MUTHER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 944, for the relief of Douglas R. Muther.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Douglas R. Muther, Hinckley, Minn., the sum of \$1,120. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for losses sustained by the said Douglas R. Muther on account of the death of Marvin D. Muther, his minor son, as the result of an accident on June 20, 1941, at Hinckley, Minn., involving a motor vehicle in the service of the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", strike out "\$1,120. The payment of such sum shall be" and insert in lieu thereof "\$620."

Line 8, after the word "for", strike out "losses sustained by the said Douglas R. Muther on account of."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWIN FAIRFAX NAULTY AND LESLIE FAIRFAX NAULTY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2003, for the compensation of Edwin Fairfax Naulty and Leslie Fairfax Naulty.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.*, That jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment, notwithstanding the lapse of time since origination, or any provision of law to the contrary, on the claims against the United States of America of Edwin Fairfax Naulty, of New York City, N. Y., and Leslie Fairfax Naulty, of Hartford, Conn., for damages alleged to have been sustained by them as the result of the use, without their consent or compensation, by the Government of the United States of America continued over a period of years of the copyrighted plans, designs, specifications of structure, construction and operation of aircraft, aircraft accessories, and other aeronautical appliances from or through the technical ideas and proposed use contained in copyrighted drawings and textual specifications of construction and operation and, also through the description of and explanation of such elements of aviation and aeronautical technique contained in bills introduced in Congress for the purchase of aviation and aeronautical inventions and technique by the Government of the United States of America from and of Edwin Fairfax Naulty and Leslie

Fairfax Naulty (part title to and in such copyrighted graphs and text also resting in Nancy Washington Naulty, of Philadelphia, Pa., and Virginia Fairfax Naulty, of Hartford, Conn., by grant from Edwin Fairfax Naulty and Leslie Fairfax Naulty) such information being indicated in the text of the items listed hereafter in this bill and contained in bills described above, in several and successive sessions of Congress and thereby available for above-described construction, operation, modification, and use of such inventions without the consent or purchase of such inventions from Edwin Fairfax Naulty and Leslie Fairfax Naulty, or either of them.

Such use is presently asserted, only in the case of the following itemized structures, at several and different periods of time by officials, officials connected with and through them, by others contracting with departments and independent offices of the United States of America for which use proper award for compensation by judgment under the common law and usage and such statutory law as may apply under the terms of the fifth amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America by Edwin Fairfax Naulty and Leslie Fairfax Naulty; suit to be brought within 2 years from the date of the enactment of this act

The items indicated are—

Fairnault cantilever flight craft, an invention of nonstrut monoplane, biplane, and multiplane aircraft, with transverse wing thorobraces and cantilever fuselage, combined with Fairnault stepped body, side-set, top-set, or under-set radiators and Fairnault movable cockpit dome.

Fairnault detachable fuel tank or container, an invention for quickly disengaging aircraft gasoline and oil containers in event of fire or other emergency during flight, and Fairnault "contents discharging" fuel and oil containers of various structures.

Fairnault portable parachute, attachable to body of pilot, an invention to provide escape from a damaged aircraft in the air, also same combined with a means of quick inflation for opening and of manual collapse control and manipulation to avoid a dangerous landing from a land plane, and combined with an air-belt life preserver to keep aviator afloat after jump from a seaplane.

Fairnault aviators' steel helmet, with removable visor, combined with wireless and interplane phone receivers and transmitters, and oxygen tube, an invention for the protection of aviators in combat, to enable them to give or receive messages in flight, to listen in on motor and air screw, or cut out noise of same, and to provide connection with an oxygen container, or compressed sea-level air container, yielding breathable air at high altitudes.

Fairnault-Weaver sectional density, metal flight wings, an invention to provide differing zenith and nadir surfaces, of fixed type, for aerofoils, embodying reduction of volume and increase in mass of aerofoils—a combination of ballistics and aviation—and also designed so that curved and regular transverse sections serve as bracing and add to strength of aerofoils.

Fairnault-Weaver sectional density flight wings, an invention factorable of fabric or metal and with variable contours controllable in operation by pilot.

Fairnault metal intermesh combined with vulcanized fabric for aircraft, an invention to provide a weatherproof "nondoped," paraelectric, slow-burning casing or covering for bodies, aerofoils, elevators, rudders, and fins, which is factored by coating suitable metal mesh with hard rubber or other suitable plastic material capable of fixation of tension and easily moldable in fabrication to any desired contour.

Fairnault variable gage bays for aerofoils, an invention by means of which the weight of metal or other material or structure and casing used in outboard bays of aircraft is

reduced proportionally, bay by bay, from fuselage to wing tips.

Fairnault movable multiple winding hexagon wireless aerial, an invention to reduce to small compass and to increase the efficiency of an aerial used on aircraft and to determine the direction of initiation of any wireless message.

Fairnault symmetrical design for aircraft, an invention by means of which all parts of an aircraft have a common dimensional divisor, or multiple, so that span, chord, gap, fuselage, structure, elevators, rudders, dihedral, cathedral, master diameter, diametric plane, fineness ratio, aspect ratio, and airscrew diameter are all in symmetrical proportion.

Nault argo, an invention of a series of stepped and variable contoured, streamlined hull designs for use as main hulls and pontoons for seaplanes.

Fairnault slot wings, 1917-18.

Fairnault laminated flight wings with air spaces between laminations. Special construction differing from Fairnault multipinion, copular, or self-flying aerofoils previously described. Fairnault slot wings of 1917-18, improved.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, from the general fund in the United States Treasury not otherwise obligated, such sums of money as may be necessary to pay the amount of any judgment rendered pursuant to this act. The amount of such judgment shall be payable by the Secretary of the Treasury on the presentation of a duly authorized copy of the judgment of the Court of Claims of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims against the United States of Edwin Fairfax Naulty and Leslie Fairfax Naulty."

FLORENCE B. HUTCHINSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1463, for the relief of Florence B. Hutchinson.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,000 to Florence B. Hutchinson, of Washington, D. C., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for reimbursement for medical and other expenses incurred by her, and for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her, when she fell getting out of an elevator on March 1, 1941, in the Champlain Apartment Building, Washington, D. C., occupied by the Securities and Exchange Commission: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "full" strike out "satisfaction of her claim against the

United States for reimbursement for medical and other expenses incurred by her, and for compensation for personal injuries" and insert "settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical, and other expenses."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRED TAYLOR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1219, for the relief of Fred Taylor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Fred Taylor, of Clemson, S. C., senior cotton technologist for United States Department of Agriculture, the sum of \$157.75, the same being in full satisfaction and settlement of expenses incurred in payment of transportation for his wife, Mrs. Ethel P. Taylor, from Manchester, England, August 27, 1939, to Washington, D. C., under instructions to evacuate on an American ship which sailed prior to receipt of specific authorization from the Department to incur such expense as provided by departmental regulations.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the words "the same being in full satisfaction and settlement of" and insert in lieu thereof the words "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for."

At end of bill strike out period and add: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. AND MRS. RICHARD STEVER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1278, for the relief of Dr. and Mrs. Richard Stever.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Dr. and Mrs. Richard Stever, of Tyrone, Pa., the sum of \$500 for personal injuries and property damage sustained when the automobile in which Mrs. Stever was driving, was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck in Altoona, Pa., on November 24, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon



conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out line 7 and line 8 and insert "in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained by them when the automobile in which they were riding."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENRY B. TUCKER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1942, for the relief of Henry B. Tucker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the limitations of time in sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled, "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Henry B. Tucker, of Vicksburg, Miss., and the Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider under the remaining provisions of said act his claim on account of injury and disability alleged to have been incurred on or about April 8, 1940, while performing his duties as an employee of the United States Engineer Office, Vicksburg, Miss.: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 6 months from the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CIVILIAN PERSONNEL OF UNITED STATES ANTARCTIC SERVICE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1724, to provide for the reimbursement of certain civilian personnel for personal property lost incident to the emergency evacuation of the United States Antarctic Service Expedition's East Base, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sum or sums, amounting in the aggregate not to exceed \$2,010.70, as may be required by the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse, under such regulations as he may prescribe, certain civilian personnel for the value of personal property lost incident to the emergency evacuation of the United States Antarctic Service Expedition's East Base on Neny Fjord, Marguerite Bay, Palmer Peninsula, Antarctica, on March 21, 1941.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Richard S. Moulton, of Washington, District of Columbia, such sum, not in excess of \$192.25, as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for the loss of personal

property as a result of a fire at the west base of the United States Antarctic Service Expedition, located near the Bay of Whales, Antarctica, on June 7, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MORRIS BURSTEIN AND JENNIE BURSTEIN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 176, for the relief of Morris Burstein and Jennie Burstein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. MOTT, Mr. BUFFETT, Mr. PRIEST, and Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommended to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

CHARLES MOLNAR

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 441, for the relief of Charles Molnar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the Attorney General is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the warrant of arrest and the order of deportation against Charles Molnar heretofore issued on the ground that admission to the United States had been fraudulently gained, and that he shall hereafter be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of April 12, 1936.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE M. LOUIE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 850, for the relief of George M. Louie.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That notwithstanding any provision of the immigration laws the temporary admission to the United States of George M. Louie is hereby declared a record of permanent admission as of the date he last temporarily entered continental United States, to wit, October 13, 1938.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCESCO P. MASTRILLI

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 480, for the relief of Francesco P. Mastrilli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cancel forthwith the outstanding warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the alien Francesco P. Mastrilli, of Utica, N. Y., and is directed not to issue any

further such warrants or orders in the case of such alien, insofar as such further warrants are based on any unlawful entry of such alien into the United States prior to the enactment of this act, or on false statements or admission of false statements in connection with any application for registry as an alien. Hereafter, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, such alien shall be considered to have been, at Norfolk, Va., on June 8, 1925, lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, and any subsequent entry of such alien into the United States shall be deemed to have been lawful.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FISIL ROSENBERG ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 771, for the relief of Fisil Rosenberg, his wife, Sofie; his daughter, Jenny; and his son, Jacques.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Fisil Rosenberg, his wife, Sofie; his daughter, Jenny; and his son, Jacques; as of August 15, 1938, the date on which they were admitted temporarily to the United States. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the Rumanian quota of the first year that said Rumanian quota is available, and two numbers from the German quota of the first year that said German quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the comma, insert "and."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "his daughter, Jenny; and his son, Jacques."

Page 2, line 2, after "available" strike out "and two numbers from the German quota of the first year that said German quota is available."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Fisil Rosenberg and his wife Sofie."

WILLIAM H. LINHART

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2016, for the relief of William H. Linhart.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws William H. Linhart shall be considered (1) to have been lawfully admitted to the United States on December 15, 1913, as an alien for permanent residence; (2) to have been dwelling in the United States on November 20, 1916, when his father, John Linhart, was naturalized a citizen of the United States; and (3) to have been, at Eastport, Idaho, on October 17, 1928, lawfully admitted to the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a set of suggestions prepared by a conference of Governors of the Corn Belt to relieve the present shortage of labor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LeCOMPTE]?

There was no objection.

## VICTORY GARDEN LEADER'S HANDBOOK

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I just want to direct the attention of the House to the fact that the Middlesex County Extension Service says that in New England canning can be done very successfully in open kettles. I have taken this up with the Department of Agriculture because I feel their information is correct.

I have a letter from the Middlesex County Extension Service as follows:

MIDDLESEX COUNTY EXTENSION SERVICE,  
CONCORD, MASS., March 10, 1943.

Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,  
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I hate to bother you with details because I know you are extremely busy but we get so many examples these days of inefficiency that I thought one minor one might be brought to your attention to show what we have to contend with. I am enclosing a Victory Garden Leader's Handbook which has just been sent out. On page 9, under "Canning," is the warning that no vegetable other than tomatoes should be canned without using a pressure cooker. I believe in certain parts of the United States this may be true, but in New England for generations our vegetables have been canned open kettle or the steam cooker method, with excellent success. This means that a bulletin of this kind mailed into New England is not only a complete loss but we again have to apologize for the errors and use valuable time in correcting the impression given.

## PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes after disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN]?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement by Hon. Elmer M. Ellsworth, a member of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO]?

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON LABOR

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor may have permission to hold hearings tomorrow afternoon while the House is in session.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON]?

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 119 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That there is hereby created a select committee to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture from among the members of the Committee on Agriculture. The chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture shall designate one of the members of the select committee as chairman. Any vacancy in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to investigate the activities of the Farm Security Administration, with a view to determining whether or not such activities are being carried on in accordance with the policies of Congress expressed in the laws administered by such Administration.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation, together with such recommendations as it deems desirable.

For the purpose of this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether or not the House is sitting, has recessed, or has adjourned, to employ such personnel, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, and to take such testimony, as it deems necessary. Subpoenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member designated by him, and shall be served by any person designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] on the minority side.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this resolution should come up at this late hour. I believe further that a quorum should be present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his point of order just a moment?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I will withhold it.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ex-

tend as part of my remarks made a few moments ago a letter from the Middlesex County Extension Service, which is in my district.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withdraw his point of order?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order temporarily.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, early in January I introduced in this body a bill, H. R. 1168, to prohibit and make illegal the appointment of "lame duck" Members of Congress—whether Representatives or Senators—to any position under the Federal Government, other than the Supreme Court or the Cabinet, within less than 2 years after the termination of their legislative service.

I believe that each of you know the meaning of the words "lame duck," but, in order that there be no question in the mind of anyone, permit me to explain that a "lame duck" is a distressed sort of a bird that has had his tail feathers kicked off by the voting portion of his constituency in the last election. In other words, a "lame duck" is an elective officeholder who finds himself so well picked and so sadly beaten and crippled by the storms of election day that he is no longer able to fly as high as he once did. Therefore, of stern necessity, he must quickly find some place to roost, rest, and refresh himself. Of course, the loftier limb he can mount upon the political plum tree, the better off he will be, for the tastier and more desirable plums are usually found on the uppermost branches.

Some people, who are kindly in their thinking, describe "lame ducks" as battle-scarred warriors, who, upon their retirement from the political arena, are entitled to a haven of rest and security where, like an old work horse, they can enjoy green pastures during their declining days without the necessity of using too much energy or making too great an effort to earn a livelihood.

Others, who are more cynical in their outlook, insist "lame ducks" are simply the flotsam and the jetsam washed up on the shores of political seas after the heavy and fearful storms of election day have spent their fury, and that such wreckage from the tempest is not usually worth the saving. To them "lame ducks" are simply political refugees—the cast-offs of public service—who, through weakness of their own, or of their positions on public questions, have lost the confidence and support of their constituents and, because of vanity, or lack of ability to earn a livelihood in civil life, attach themselves to the public pay roll in some appointive position where the electorate cannot get at them.

Personally, I cannot subscribe to any of these particular descriptions of, or



beliefs concerning, "lame ducks." In my life and time I have known many "lame ducks"—yea, literally thousands of them. Within their ranks have been the rich and the poor, the high and the low, the weak and the strong, the good and the bad. Many have had only themselves to blame for their distressing situation, while others have fallen by the wayside through no inherent weakness or fault of their own. Yet each and every one of the "lame ducks" I have known, as well as the thousands of others whose names have been inscribed upon the lists of the vanquished, has had his offer of continued public service rejected by his constituents in the only way the people can speak—through the voice of the ballot box.

The man who voluntarily retires from elective public office is not a "lame duck." To be a "lame duck" one must have served in office, offered himself as a candidate for reelection to that office, and have had his offer rejected at the polls. And I contend the reason why the voters saw fit to reject the continuance of the gentleman's public service makes no real difference. Whether the voters are angry, disgusted, and resentful over some of the past actions of the candidate, or simply decide they love him less and his opponent more, matters not. The fact remains his offer to continue in public office has been turned down by the electorate. By their votes his constituents have demonstrated their willingness and their desire he be separated from the public pay roll. That is the only thing that counts.

Throughout the more than 150 years of our national life the practice of appointing "lame ducks" to nonelective positions in the Government has grown and flourished. Every political party and every administration has indulged in the practice of caring for their weaker brethren at the expense of the taxpayer. It is one of the faults and weaknesses of our form of government. While there may be many arguments, including charity, that can be advanced in favor of this practice, I still contend that it is an evil one; and certainly one that is not conducive to good government or to public morale. Instead it destroys the faith of the people in their system of government. The only way American citizens have of directly expressing themselves in the affairs of their Government is through the ballot box. I insist that when the people speak through the majesty and the authority of the ballot and say they no longer want a man to serve them in public office, then that gentleman should gracefully retire from the field, and not seek or accept a position of public trust and responsibility through Presidential or political appointment. "Lame duck" appointments defeat the purpose and the will of the people. They help destroy respect for representative government.

Oh, I know, Mr. Speaker, it can be argued the voting public has not always been wise or selective in the choices they have made at the polls. That is undoubtedly true. It cannot be denied that at times they elect to public office

men unfitted to serve. Neither can it be denied that the people often reject the services of the best qualified. Yet it is the right of the people—and their right only—to pass judgment upon aspirants to elective office. Once that judgment is passed it should be respected. It should not be circumvented by naming to positions of power and authority the very individuals whose offers of service have been rejected.

As I said a moment ago, all parties and all administrations have taken care of their friends through "lame duck" appointments. Yet, Mr. Speaker, it is my conviction this indefensible practice has been growing in recent years. Certainly no party in power has ever made as many "lame duck" appointments as has the Roosevelt administration. Recent weeks have brought the appointments of more "lame ducks" to public office than any like time in American political history. Of course, in all fairness, I must admit the elections of November 3 last made more legislators eligible for "lame duck" appointments than we have had in many years. Perhaps I should also add it is entirely possible an even greater supply of "lame ducks" will be made available in early November of 1944. However, the prospect of such an increased supply should not cause too much alarm, for the "lame ducks" of 1944 will have but a short time in which to grab a place on the public pay roll.

However, Mr. Speaker, I believe we should take the time here and now to discuss among ourselves some recent "lame duck" appointments, and especially of those who served in the Seventy-seventh Congress. In discussing these individuals who have been the recipients of juicy political plums, I want it distinctly understood that I am making no personal attack on any of them. All are fine gentlemen. Otherwise they would not have been elected to Congress in the first place. Many of them have been, and are, my personal friends. All are enjoyable companions and men of good character and reputation. Nevertheless they are "lame ducks" just the same, and are occupying their present positions as the result of a practice I believe is undemocratic and un-American, and one that should be stamped out.

But to get back to the "lame ducks," and the positions to which they have so recently been appointed: "Lame duck" No. 1—the chief gander of the present flock resulting from the horrible day of November 3, 1942—is Prentiss Brown, of Michigan, former Senator from that great State. Prentiss Brown—no relation to me—is the head man down at the Office of Price Administration, having been appointed by the President early in January to take the place of that gone but not forgotten stormy petrel and leading proponent of bureaucratic control and regimentation, boisterous, blundering Leon Henderson. Now personally Prentiss Brown is a gentleman of good character and reputation, as well as of talent and ability. I believe every Member of Congress will agree to that. Also every one of you must concede that Mr. Brown's services in leading the fight for

the amendment to the Price Control Act sought by the President last September have not gone unrewarded. He did a good job carrying the ball for the administration. In all candor I must even admit that at times his open field running was superb, and that one or two of his pivot plays were especially spectacular and created considerable comment.

Yes; Prentiss Brown made a good fight of it in the Senate, and undoubtedly he believed the position he took and the policies he stood for were right. However, the people of his home State of Michigan, who were responsible for his being in the Senate, seemingly disagreed with him. This was especially true of his former constituents. I do not believe there is anyone here but who thinks Prentiss Brown was defeated for reelection because of the part he took in the fight over the price-control legislation before Congress last autumn. I think that is simply a historical fact. The people of Michigan did not like the representation he gave them on that matter. Therefore, they defeated him at the polls—or to put it more bluntly, the legislative services of Prentiss Brown were rejected, and the policies for which he stood were repudiated at the ballot box.

Yet, under the practice of appointing "lame ducks" to office, we find Mr. Brown, by Presidential designation within 15 days after he went out of office as Senator, placed in charge of the very program and the very policies for the support of which he was defeated at the polls by his constituents. Despite the emphatic manner in which the electors of the State of Michigan made known their opposition to the price-control beliefs and policies of Senator Brown he was named to head the Office of Price Administration, where he now makes effective those very beliefs and policies which brought about his defeat for reelection.

I say to you that the only curb the American people have on their public officials is through the right of the ballot, whereby they can vote against those individuals with whose beliefs, theories, or policies they disagree. I say to circumvent or to set aside the decision of the voters in such a case by the "lame duck" appointment of the defeated candidate to the very office administering the legislative policies, the support of which brought about the candidate's defeat, is not fair and is not right. It is a practice that should be stopped.

Serving under Mr. Brown as his chief administrative assistant in the Office of Price Administration is former Senator Clyde Herring, of Iowa, another strong administration supporter who was defeated for reelection last November. Mr. Herring is well known for his political sagacity and his ability to get along with people. It is understood that it was these very qualifications, as well as his intense loyalty to the New Deal administration, that brought about his "lame duck" appointment to a job said to be entirely political in nature, for which he will receive, so I am informed, a salary of \$10,000 per year.

Another "lame duck" who has been rewarded for past services is our old friend and former Senator, Josh Lee, of Oklahoma, who for a long time was one of the most vocal supporters of the New Deal here on the Hill. When Josh Lee went down to defeat last November it was more of a surprise to the rest of the country, and perhaps to Josh, than it was to the people of Oklahoma. But his good friend, the President, hastened to make amends by naming him a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board at a salary of \$10,000 per year. The appointment was first tendered before the Seventy-seventh Congress ended, but had to be withdrawn inasmuch as a sitting Member of Congress cannot be appointed to any Federal office for the creation of which he had voted. However, almost immediately after the Seventy-eighth Congress came into session Mr. Lee's name was again presented for confirmation. Today he is serving a long term on the Civil Aeronautics Board—a perfect example of a "lame duck" appointee.

And we must not overlook another gentleman whose name rates high on the "lame duck" list—former Senator Harry Schwartz, of Wyoming. Harry is a likable fellow who always boasted of his undying loyalty and unswerving fidelity to the President. Such loyalty and fidelity have already had their reward, bringing to him the juicy "lame duck" appointment of a lengthy term on the National Mediation Board at the same salary he drew as the legislative representative of his people—\$10,000 per year.

Our former colleague, Wall Doxey, of Mississippi, who was promoted to the Senate a few years ago and defeated in the primary last summer, has done all right for himself, too, in the way of a "lame duck" appointment. He is now Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate, for which service he draws a salary of \$8,000 each year.

Now, I hope you ladies and gentlemen of the House will not feel that our body has been overlooked in the matter of "lame duck" appointments simply because I have not mentioned them as yet. The record discloses that we are receiving our full share of the fruit from the administration plum tree.

Our former colleague and young friend, Thomas H. Eliot, of the Harvard Eliots of Massachusetts, known so well to us as an ardent liberal and New Dealer of the Frankfurter type, has been named Chief of the British Division in the Office of War Information with headquarters in London. I do not know the salary Tom receives. Seemingly that information was not given out by the Office of War Information. So far as I know, Tom Eliot—who is a delightful gentleman—has never had any experience or training as a newspaperman, or any connection with press relations, although I have noticed a number of articles concerning him and his services in the Daily Worker, PM, the New Republic, and similar publications. Anyhow, Tom is now enjoying a "lame duck" appointment and is well set on the public pay roll.

Down in the War Production Board we have another one of our colleagues enjoying the succulent fruit from the political plum tree in the form of a "lame-duck" appointment. I speak of that radio crooner and potato peeling former statesman from the deep South, our contemporary in the Seventy-seventh and previous Congresses—Luther Patrick.

It will be remembered that Luther fell by the wayside in the Democratic primary last year. At that time it was rumored that some of Luther's radio wit had come back to haunt him, but in a speech from the well of this House he explained his defeat by saying that the voters—being unable to hit directly at the bureaucrats—took a crack at him instead. Evidently Luther believes in the old preachment of "When you can't lick 'em, then jine 'em," for according to reports Luther himself is now one of the bureaucrats, having recently taken a "lame duck" appointment down in the War Production Board, where—believe it or not—he has become such an expert on highway construction that he is said to have recently advised one of the Members here that a highway overpass could not be constructed, although it was already built at the time and had been in use for several months.

All of which proves that Luther has learned the ropes rapidly and is performing in true bureaucratic style.

And up in Hartford, Conn., the War Manpower Commission is to have a new head of the regional office in the person of William J. Fitzgerald, who served with us during the Seventy-seventh Congress, but met defeat in his campaign for reelection last Autumn. Mr. Fitzgerald has just been appointed—so tally one more on to the "lame duck" score.

Out in the Middle West we have a new regional director in the Office of Price Administration with headquarters in Chicago, but recently appointed at a remuneration of \$8,000 per year. He is our old friend and former colleague, Raymond S. McKeough, of Chicago, protégé of the famous Kelly-Nash political machine of that city, who left his seat in this honored body to be the New Deal candidate for the Senate last November against the present incumbent, Mr. Brooks. Now Raymond can enjoy home life in Chicago, without having to meet the high cost of Washington living, and without campaign expenses; unless he is called upon to attend too many Jackson Day banquets.

Two or three weeks ago my old neighbor in the House Office Building, former Representative Charles F. McLaughlin, of Nebraska—and no finer gentleman ever lived—who met defeat for reelection in the upsurge of Republicanism last November, was named to a \$10,000 job as a member of the American-Mexican Claims Commission—another appointment of a "lame duck."

Any of you who go down to the White House—and I frankly admit that I am seldom invited there—will find an old acquaintance busily at work as administrative assistant to the President. You will recognize this genial and smiling gentleman as former Representative

James M. Barnes, of Illinois, who, incidentally, is a graduate of dear old Harvard, but a "lame duck" just the same, for he, too, met defeat in the election of November 3 last. Jimmie will receive for his services the same annual salary paid him as a Member of this body, to wit: \$10,000 per annum; but in addition thereto he will have the honor and pleasure of basking in the sunshine of F. D. R.'s famous smile, for which privilege undoubtedly some sitting Members would be willing to become "lame ducks" right now.

Another former colleague of ours—former Representative Will Rogers, who is not a relative of the famous deceased humorist of the same name, I understand—has been taken care of in a "lame duck" appointment by the House, as he started a short time ago on his new duties as investigator of personnel practices, for which he will receive \$6,000 a year, plus expenses.

And down at the Navy Department, in Under Secretary Forrestal's office, can be found one of my former colleagues from Ohio, Jacob E. Davis, who I understand is serving as civilian aide and assistant to the Under Secretary. Jake, as he is better known to Ohioans, was defeated for reelection in the Republican landslide last November, but he is still enjoying the Washington climate as a "lame duck" appointee at an unknown salary, but one which I am sure is commensurate with Jake's well-known ability.

Another "lame duck" appointment, but recently made, is that of John M. Houston, who represented the Wichita, Kans., District in the Congress until January last, when he was forced to sever connections with this honorable body as a result of coming in second in the November 3d derby. Jack, as he is known to all of us—and he is one of the most sociable and best liked colleagues any of us ever had—has been given a "lame duck" appointment as member of the National Labor Relations Board at the same salary he received while in this body.

These "lame duck" appointments have been pouring out of the White House so thick and fast since January 3 that it is almost impossible to keep up with them. In all probability I have missed some, or perhaps new appointments have been announced since I began these remarks. In any event it is evident that the end is not yet, as I understand there are quite a large number of our former colleagues, from both bodies of the National Legislature, who are remaining in Washington in the hope that the Great White Father may reach out his kindly hand and drop into their outstretched palms the much-sought-after royal fruit—one of those juicy plums of political pap and patronage known as a "lame duck" appointment. Some of the waiting gentlemen may be disappointed in the end, but, at the present rate "lame duck" appointments are being made, it seems likely most of them may place their feet firmly in the public trough within the not too distant future.



In the fear that some vicious partisan may accuse our beloved Chief Executive of being unappreciative of his friends, I believe I should list here, for the record, the names and positions of a few of the "lame ducks" that have received largess at the hands of a beneficent President during the past 4 years. Among them are: Former Senator Henry F. Ashurst, of Arizona, defeated in 1940 and later appointed to the United States Immigration Board of Appeals at a salary of \$10,000 per year; former Senator Fred L. Brown, of New Hampshire, named Comptroller General in 1939 at a salary of \$10,000; former Senator F. Ryan Duffy, of Wisconsin, named Federal district judge for eastern Wisconsin, following his defeat in 1938; that stalwart New Deal leader and whip of another body, former Senator Sherman Minton, of Indiana, placed on the United States Court of Appeals at an annual remuneration of \$12,500, following his defeat for reelection in 1940; former Senator James Pope, of Idaho, who was given a \$10,000 a year plum as a member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority after his defeat in 1938; and former Senator Robert J. Bulkley, of my own State of Ohio, defeated in 1938, who is now serving on the Board of Appeals on visa cases at \$10,000 per year.

From the House side recent "lame duck" appointments include Thomas R. Amlie, of Wisconsin, who was named to the Interstate Commerce Commission, only to have his appointment withdrawn from the Senate later; our former colleague, Alfred F. Beiter, of New York, who received a "lame duck" appointment as Assistant Secretary of the Interior after his defeat in 1938; former Representative John J. Dempsey, of New Mexico, named to the United States Maritime Commission, but now serving as Governor of that great State; former Representative Michael Igoe, of Illinois, appointed to the United States district court; former Representative George B. Kelly, of New York, designated as Regional Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor; former Representative John C. Lehr, of Michigan, appointed as United States district attorney; former Representative John J. McGrath, of California, as District Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Service; former Representative David J. Lewis, of Maryland, the President's entry for the Senate in the purge campaign against TYDINGS, named to the National Mediation Board; former Representative Maury Maverick, of Texas, named as head of the Bureau of Governmental Requirements of the War Production Board; former Representative Claude Parsons, of Illinois, appointed as Assistant Administrator of the United States Housing Administration; and former Representative John Utterback, of Maine, serving as United States marshal for that State.

The requests of all these gentlemen to continue in public office as representatives of the people were rejected at the polls by a vote of the electorate; but, while their constituents may have said,

through the ballot, that their services were no longer wanted, the President and his administration decided otherwise and placed them back on the public pay roll as "lame duck" appointees.

In addition to the men whom I have already named, there is another group of appointees that I might mention this afternoon. None of the membership of this group can rightfully be called lame ducks, for actually they only tried for office, as New Deal candidates for the House or Senate, but failed of election. Nevertheless, they have been appointed to lucrative positions. I shall not attempt to name them all, but one of the latest instances is that of James Allred of Texas, who was the New Deal candidate for the Senate against the sitting Member, Senator McDANIEL, in the recent Texas primary. Allred's nomination for appointment to the United States Court of Appeals is now before the Senate, where a hot fight is being made against his confirmation by a number of southern Democrats so uncooperative as to at least infer that the appointment has come as payment of a political debt.

Another is the case of Mrs. Dorothy K. Roosevelt of Michigan, a relative of the White House Roosevelts, and the New Deal candidate in the last election against Congressman DONDERO, who has but recently been named to an important and well-paying position in the War Production Board.

No, such appointments are not lame-duck appointments, but neither are they conducive to the theory or the belief that politics has been adjourned for the duration.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a serious appeal to the membership of this body to give its support to H. R. 1168 now pending in the Judiciary Committee. I hope that great committee will take prompt and favorable action on this measure, and, if it is approved by the House, as I believe it should and will be, then this Congress will have taken a long step toward eliminating the indefensible practice of "lame duck" appointments. The prohibition contained in this bill against the appointment of defeated Members of Congress to public office during the 2 years following the termination of service in the legislative branch will work no injury to the Government and will not interfere with the Nation obtaining the services of outstanding citizens. For the 2 years—the 24 months' period provided in this measure—can be considered a sabbatical leave from public service, if you so wish to designate it, and would give an opportunity to those who are weary and worn from their labors in the Congress, and perhaps bruised and wounded from waging a losing political battle, to rest and refresh themselves, to mingle once more with the folks back home, and to perhaps obtain a new understanding of the problems of the common people, so that when the call to reenter the public service does come they will be more energetic, more considerate, and perhaps even more appreciative, than if they had been permitted to take up other public duties

almost immediately following the end of their services in the legislative halls.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this resolution would authorize the Committee on Agriculture of the House to conduct some investigation of the activities of the Farm Security Administration. I have persistently during this session voted against the establishment of any special investigating committee, but I do think it is a good thing for a legislative committee to follow through and look somewhat into the administration of a law originating in that committee.

This resolution only invests the Committee on Agriculture with the authority to subpoena witnesses and to expend a small amount of money that may hereafter be appropriated for the purposes of this investigation.

If I may be permitted, Mr. Speaker, I should like to yield at this time to my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], who has been active in this matter and who will likely be a member of the investigating committee, and who has recently given some evidence of the fact that he has an inquisitive mind.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further consideration of this resolution be postponed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by inserting in the RECORD a speech recently made by Hon. John Haynes, ex-Under Secretary of the Treasury, before the Pennsylvania Economy League, on the subject of reciprocal trade agreements.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents who spent a few days in Washington recently came home with a two-word description of our Nation's Capital. He called it organized chaos. In the past few weeks, a good many newspaper commentators and radio analysts have been giving us just about the same impression. I do not believe that this view of the Capital is completely accurate. Of course, there are literally hundreds of Government offices and agencies dealing with the thousand and one problems of the war. There are hundreds of thousands of men and women working in our Government offices on all sorts of jobs. They range from the simplest mechanical work to the making of important policies. It is understandable that confusion, division of responsibility, lack of information must result from any concentration of agencies and people on so large a scale. But the important thing to remember is this: In spite of the widely publicized clashes of personalities

in some departments, in spite of the appearance of confusion, the work is still going forward. The war plants whose flow of materials is determined in Washington are getting their supplies. Our huge and complicated industrial organization is functioning day and night throughout the entire country no matter how much Washington argues.

We should not lose sight of this major fact. Certainly, the spectacular battles for power inside our War Production Board, the constant differences of opinion between Manpower Commission officials and our local draft boards, make good news stories. They should not let us forget that the work is going on no matter what happens in Washington.

No one believes for a minute that Americans can ever be satisfied with any production record, but we should bear in mind that we are turning out planes, guns, munitions, faster than anyone ever dreamed possible a short time ago. This is, after all, the main show. Washington today is really the side show.

In Congress, we get to see a good many things very close up. During the past few weeks, the controversy between Congress and the White House has been all over page 1. It has been charged that some Members of Congress are criticizing solely for the sake of criticism. Those columnists who make a living out of calling other folks names have been pouring out printer's ink by the gallon. No one objects to fair comment. Everybody in public life expects to "take it" now and then. But when you stop to look at the things that are happening, you may find that Congress is more sinned against than sinning.

For the past 3 months, taxpayers have been utterly unable to make head or tail out of the taxation picture. They did not know whether they were going to pay 1942 taxes in 1943 or 1943 taxes in 1950. Some folks have been blaming Congress for this muddle. It is pretty hard to see why. For the past 10 years, the fiscal policy of our country has been determined 100 percent by the Executive. The Constitution gives the House of Representatives the sole right to initiate appropriation measures, but everybody above the fifth grade knows that the appropriations passed by Congress are determined by the activities of our Government. In the past 10 years, our philosophy of Government has been just this: "Give everybody as much as he wants. Make everybody happy today. Let tomorrow take care of itself." Today, with a huge war on our hands we have suddenly discovered that tomorrow is here. We are paying and paying heavily. Before it is all over, we shall probably find that we must pay still more.

Well then, why not do something to help soften the blow? Why not pass the Ruml plan? Why not adopt legislation similar to the Canadian plan of part payments for 1942 with a spread of the balance. The answer here is simple. Our executive department is in favor of the pay-as-you-go plan in principle, but it is absolutely unable to decide on which one of half a dozen plans it wants.

Congress is ready to pass pay-as-you-go tax legislation right now if only the

Treasury will make clear exactly what is needed. If Congress had not spent the last 10 years under the heel of the White House, our Democratic majority would not be floundering hopelessly around waiting for signals from Capitol Hill. As matters now stand, it is becoming clear to everyone that the Republicans in Congress must take the lead in reestablishing the authority of the legislative body. The Republicans in Congress are ready to vote for a pay-as-you-go plan at once. We are waiting for the Democrats.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Do the Republicans have a leader whom they can follow?

Mr. BENDER. We have the finest leader on this side of the House the Republican Party ever had, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I mean a leader of the Republican Party. I do not mean the minority leader of the House.

Mr. BENDER. The Republican Party has many distinguished leaders. For example, we have in Ohio a very fine leader, of whom we are exceedingly proud, our Governor, John W. Bricker.

Mr. EBERHARTER. That is a boost for his aspirations for the Presidential nomination, is it not?

Mr. BENDER. As far as his aspirations for the Presidency are concerned, our Governor is not pushing himself. The people of our State and people everywhere throughout the Nation recognize his great ability. You hear the name of Bricker on the lips of all citizens, because of his fine accomplishments and because of his excellent record as Governor of our State. He has had three consecutive terms. This is the first time a Governor has been elected for three consecutive terms in the history of Ohio, and each time he has been elected by a much larger majority, because of the excellence of his service and because he keeps his word. When he makes a promise he follows it up with performance. He has kept his word with the people of Ohio. He has done a remarkable job there, and, under the circumstances, we in Ohio of course look with favor on John W. Bricker. On both sides of the aisle here in Congress you hear John Bricker spoken of very well.

Mr. EBERHARTER. I will admit that the Governor of Ohio is now serving his third term, but on many of the most important issues of the day, with which the entire American public is very deeply concerned, he has failed to take a position. A person who fails to take a position on the most important issues of the day certainly cannot hope that the people of America will look upon him as a leader to take us out of these times, when everybody is concerned about the future.

Mr. BENDER. I am sure the gentleman is not very well informed as to the Governor's position. The Governor has taken a position on every important issue that has been brought to his attention. He is doing his level best for the war effort as he has on the home front. Above all, however, he has tended to

the business of the State of Ohio in a manner that has attracted Nation-wide attention. He has kept his own house in order and done a good job with the things at hand. He is honest, intelligent, and courageous. He is not a sleight-of-hand performer like some leaders around here. Would that we had some of his forthrightness right here in Washington. Governor Bricker is no Machiavelli.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Of course, I have no interest whatever in whom the Republican Party may choose as its standard-bearer, because I personally, and I think the majority of the people of this country will agree with me, believe that no matter who the Republicans' standard-bearer is, he will not have a ghost of a show insofar as winning the Presidency is concerned. I submit that the Governor of Ohio certainly has not stood forth as any shining light as far as showing his ability in matters of Nation-wide and international interest is concerned.

Mr. BENDER. If the gentleman feels so sure of his position, why should he be so concerned about our Governor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Under a previous special order, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], is recognized for 45 minutes.

#### AXIS PROPAGANDA

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk today about Axis propaganda and the manner in which our Office of War Information is replying to it with trustworthy news about the United States.

There has been a lot of talk about O. W. I. programs, and some of it has been idle talk. Some people seem to have forgotten that we are in a war, that the very existence of this country and the security of our homes depend on winning the war.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I hope the gentleman will let me make a few statements.

Mr. TABER. I would prefer that the gentleman yield now because of what he said.

Mr. CELLER. I have the highest regard for the gentleman from New York, and yield to him.

Mr. TABER. Did the gentleman mean to refer to me when he said that some people did not appear to know we were in a war?

Mr. CELLER. No, indeed; I was speaking generally. If the gentleman will bear with me, he will find that although I differ with him and he differs with me, I respect his opinion.

The exhibit I have prepared, and which was shown in the lobby on Monday, and this smaller exhibit in the well, gives some notion of the immense proportions of Axis propaganda. There was in this exhibit before us on Monday—part of which is here now—182 books, magazines, and pamphlets prepared by the Axis for distribution throughout the world.

Thousands and thousands of Axis publications are flooding South America, Europe, Africa, the Middle East, and the Orient, at the cost of millions and mil-



lions of dollars. The Axis is most prodigal in expending money for the control of men's minds. Spain, Sweden, Turkey, Portugal, and other neutral countries have for years been indoctrinated with nazi-ism and fascism.

These countries know little of our advancements in culture, the arts, sciences, and economics. They know little of our habits, customs, history, and traditions. They know nothing, for example, of the T. V. A. or the Grand Coulee Dam. They know us only through Nazi-Fascist eyes.

What we can do under democratic institutions is undisclosed to them; nay, more, democracy is distorted by Axis radio and pamphlets.

Neutrals must finally choose, and Axis controlled countries must eventually choose between democracy and totalitarianism. How can they select intelligently, unless they understand democracy, understand our government, our aims, our freedoms? We have not told yet adequately our side of the story to them and that we must do.

The Germans, the Italians, and the Japanese are making war upon the world. They have entered into a gigantic and sinister conspiracy to enslave all countries and all peoples. They are to be the Herrenvolk. We are to be the Sklavenfolk. The issue is as clear and as plain as that. They are to be the masters. We are to be the slaves.

Our enemies fight the war with no holds barred. They fight the war, not part time, not half time, but 24 hours a day. They fight with every weapon in the arsenal. With guns, yes; with tanks, yes; with planes and submarines and flame throwers, yes. And they fight also with propaganda.

Japanese soldiers took Burma. Their planes and guns did the job in the end, but part of the victory belongs to propaganda. Japanese propaganda had softened up Burma. Long before the piratical military attack, propaganda had seeped into Burma like a poison, dividing the native leaders, splitting faction from faction, paving the way for the monstrous delusion that the Japanese came as deliverers from British rule, as missionaries of Oriental freedom. The Burmese know now that the Japanese promises were lies, all lies, for the Japanese are now the masters in Burma and the people of Burma are now slaves.

I sometimes think that we in America hold our enemies too cheaply. We do not appreciate the brilliant cynicism, the profound contempt for the human soul, which has marked the progress of Adolf Hitler and his satellites since 1933; their psychological warfare before the gray hordes poured into Poland during the calamitous summer of 1939. Skillfully, with technical excellence, without regard for expense, through every known device for spreading information, Germany disseminated its propaganda to the far ends of the earth. The Germans are still busy at the same old job. They are especially busy in the neutral countries, such as Turkey, Portugal, and Spain. They are busy in the countries they have

occupied. They or their Axis partners are busy all over Asia. They are utilizing the radio, the newspapers, the magazines. Their publications, beautifully printed, handsomely illustrated, very expensive, flow in a deadly stream out of Germany, Italy, and Japan to pollute the mind of the world.

We set O. W. I. to blunt the edge of these psychological weapons used by the Axis Powers. The O. W. I. is doing a good job, but the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and others apparently think otherwise. The O. W. I. is not infallible. It makes, it admits errors. It is worthy, I believe, and I sincerely feel that better treatment at the hands of some Members in this Chamber should be given. We all have the highest regard for the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], but—

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. CELLER. Just let me finish the sentence. Mr. TABER is an indefatigable worker—earnest, sincere, patriotic, but rather insistent at times on the political side. I now yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. I say this to the gentleman: That Elmer Davis has given a more sweeping indictment of the O. W. I. and its operations than I have. He has said repeatedly that his victory proposition here was nothing but propaganda. He has said that picture book that I criticized was a failure. When he does that he goes further than I do.

Mr. CELLER. I did not yield for a speech.

Mr. TABER. I think if that kind of business is going on I must make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. CELLER. I do not think the gentleman should do that.

Mr. TABER. When the gentleman goes about saying things like that it is time for me to speak.

Mr. CELLER. I said I respected the gentleman's views.

Mr. TABER. But the gentleman misstates my views.

Mr. CELLER. I have not said a word about them. I said I disagreed with the gentleman's views, but let me say what I think about the situation. I am happy to yield to the gentleman, but the gentleman does not even let me make a statement about what the gentleman did say, and I want to do that, and then I will be very happy to have the gentleman counter to what I am going to say.

Now, with reference to the distinguished gentleman, I say again I yield to no man in my admiration for him. He is the Cerberus—watchdog—of the Treasury. But that does not mean that the gentleman is right in all his observations on all departments of government, and certainly he should appreciate that we could have some views that differ with his. That is all I am doing. I differ with him and I still respect the gentleman's views.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman mean that what I said was a political propaganda proposition?

Mr. CELLER. No; I do not say that bluntly. I do say that the gentleman's strictures upon O. W. I. may not be without political significance.

Mr. TABER. Or that I made my statements from a political standpoint?

Mr. CELLER. Not, perhaps, directly, but the gentleman, who is certainly within his rights, may sometimes be prompted by political considerations.

Mr. TABER. I made them for the purpose of cleaning up the O. W. I. and giving Elmer Davis a chance to do a decent job instead of a bad one.

Mr. CELLER. I said I felt that the gentleman at times was too insistent on the political side. That is all I said.

Mr. TABER. But that implied the other thing. I want it clearly understood that my effort was to make Mr. Davis clean up the situation and quit political propaganda.

Mr. CELLER. I said that the gentleman was a patriotic Member of this House and the gentleman is right in voicing his views, whatever they may be, although there are many others who will disagree with him. I believe the gentleman is grievously wrong and somewhat unjust in what he says about Elmer Davis and the Office of War Information.

For example the gentleman from New York last Saturday attempted to discredit Mr. Davis and the O. W. I. by drawing attention among other things to a movie short called The Price of Victory, built around a speech by Mr. WALLACE on May 18, 1942. Our friend from New York dubbed it "communistic." I fear the gentleman from New York may be seeing "red" in that regard, and probably whenever he seeks to appease his anger that may develop because of seeing the magazine Victory and this movie short, The Price of Victory, he probably rushes to an old mental closet and there he picks out an old epithet, "communistic" or "Red" or "Marxist" and applies it to somebody for the purpose of appeasing his anger.

Mr. TABER. Now, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I must say that the gentleman is going a long, long way. He is getting very close to stepping upon the rules; but I want to say to the gentleman that folks should not have said the things that are in that movie unless they expected to have the correct and honest construction that I put upon them placed upon them.

Mr. CELLER. With reference to that movie, The Price of Victory, the gentleman will admit that it was not prepared by the O. W. I. It was prepared by a private concern, Paramount Pictures, Inc. It has been shown—

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, it said, "Produced by Office of War Information" right on it.

Mr. CELLER. Well, it had been shown throughout the country.

Mr. TABER. And it was at their expense.

Mr. CELLER. It had been shown throughout the country in commercial theaters for several months. The O. W. I.

arranged for making copies and displaying same to various civic organizations.

The O. W. I. prepared a 15-minute radio program for Washington's Birthday, depicting the troubles of the "Father of His Country" with his Continental Congress. It is historically true. All great Presidents have had clashes with Congresses—Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, Cleveland, and Teddy Roosevelt—but I am afraid our good friend from upper New York somewhat twisted the O. W. I.'s purpose into an attack by indirection upon the present Congress. Again I feel the gentleman was in error.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I would like to have the gentleman give us any other object of putting the thing out than just that one that I implied.

Mr. CELLER. I said a moment ago it was historically true, all great Presidents have had difficulties with Congresses. It shows how democracy is forged on the anvil of differences of opinion, and Presidents have differed with Congresses; Congresses have differed with Presidents. That radio program was an indication on Washington's Birthday of something which was of historical value to the entire Nation.

A second radio transcript was objected to. It is of a fictitious character, "Old Joe Mazerak," a Polish worker in a steel mill. Old Joe Mazerak first appeared on the Prudential Life Insurance Co. hour on the Columbia Broadcasting System. Mr. Davis said, "The O. W. I. liked it and got permission from the life-insurance company to use it." The program opens with remarks about Hitler's effort to sow discord among the people of America, and the iron-bound spirit of American unity that defeats him. I fear the gentleman from New York is wrong when he lays a heavy hand upon Mr. Davis and that radio script.

I do hope that the gentleman will be a little more kindly when he views these scripts and these motion pictures that emanate from the O. W. I.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. TABER. When Mr. Davis was before the Congress for money it was the consensus of opinion that the American people were not yellow, they did not need the propaganda coming out from the Government to arouse their patriotism.

Mr. CELLER. I will come to that.

Mr. TABER. I am frankly of that opinion today, quite decidedly.

Mr. CELLER. I do not think that Mr. Davis is using propaganda with reference to the United States. He wants the truth; he is giving out the truth; he is giving out news in true fashion, in truth and in fact. You may remember that when we had the trial of the eight Nazi saboteurs, Mr. Davis insisted on publicity being given to that trial and he was denied the right to give publicity to the evidence given at the trial and whatever happened in the trial. The Army refused to allow the trial to

have any publicity. Mr. Davis protested. He said that the American people "can take it" and they should have the true news. He even went so far as to go to the White House and he threatened to resign unless there was the fullest publicity with reference to this trial, and he finally got some modicum of publicity on that trial, but when it came subsequently to the trial of those who aided the saboteurs as a result of the fight he put up, there was full publicity given to the trial of the conspirators.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. TABER. Does not the gentleman realize the difference between propaganda and news?

Mr. CELLER. I certainly do.

Mr. TABER. One item was news. The thing that has been criticized is propaganda.

Mr. CELLER. I heard Mr. Davis the other night on the radio give what he thought to be an appropriate résumé of what is happening on the battle fronts. There was not an iota of propaganda in what he said. There was nothing said in his comments but the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth with reference to what our soldiers were doing on the battle fronts. His attitude is the same on the home front.

I will say this to my good friend from New York: We must counteract all this dreadful, deadly, poisonous propaganda of the Nipponese, of Fascists, and Nazis. We did not take a page out of their book and counter fascism, nipponism, and nazi-ism by lies, lies, lies. Anything that we put forward you will find was and is the truth and nothing but the truth; information that is accurate, stories that are accurate of our war aims and of what democracy means, and the "four freedoms," the Bill of Rights, and our Constitution.

The gentleman from New York objects to the magazine called Victory because it was a personalized affair in the sense that our President and others high in authority are featured in that book. Let me say that in Axis-controlled and neutral countries you cannot put across a message successfully without regard to personalities. To people used to excessive Axis personalized propaganda, inured to reading, hearing, and seeing messages of, by, and for persons—dictators like Hitler, Mussolini, Franco, Antonescu, Horthy—it is essential to channelize counterpropaganda along personal lines: Roosevelt against Hitler; Churchill against Mussolini; Chiang Kai-shek against Hirohito; otherwise the effort is meaningless and the money is wasted.

Roosevelt significantly to Europeans epitomizes America. Roosevelt cartoons, in my humble estimation, are a sort of saga of American life.

The President—

Says Mr. Davis—

symbolizes the United States Government as a powerful nation and as a land of liberty and democracy.

Whether I or the gentleman from New York, our esteemed friend, approves or no, whether we like it or not, nevertheless

to most Italians, Germans, Frenchmen, Spaniards, Norwegians, the United States is Roosevelt and Roosevelt is the United States. The most simple way therefore to picture the United States is by a series of snapshots or drawings of the high spots of Roosevelt's life. Roosevelt is for this purpose our greatest asset. It were asinine, therefore, to my mind, not to capitalize that asset and to counteract this miserable, poisonous type of propaganda that is flooding all the cities and the countryside of Europe.

I believe the O. W. I. is doing a great job with great men to interpret the United States to alien nations, but more important than that to properly present the real picture of the United States, to counteract Axis falsehoods about us, to make the people of the Axis-controlled and neutral countries like the United States. We must have this type of literature to make the Danes, the Germans, the Italians, the Spaniards, and the Japs appreciate the American Bill of Rights, the Atlantic Charter, and the "four freedoms" and to have them respect American democracy wherein, in the words of George Washington, "every man can sit under his own vine and fig tree and there shall be none to make him afraid," to make Hans in the Reich, Luigi in Italy, Pedro in Portugal, Olaf in Sweden, Erik in Norway, Batista in Spain, Ali Baba in Turkey realize that nazi-ism and fascism are enslavement worse than death and finally to have it dawn on all that trying to break and defeat the United States is like trying to hold back the tide with a groan.

To show how personalized the war for men's minds has become, reflect and know that the most powerful blows delivered by Britain and the United States have been those of personalities, Churchill and Roosevelt. The Librarian of Congress, Archibald MacLeish, recently said:

One need only recall the words and actions by which the loss of British prestige at Dunkerque was turned into the greatest victory British repute has ever won to estimate the role played by the Prime Minister in the struggle to convince the world, and above all to convince the German people, that Britain cannot be defeated in this war. And as for our own country, the massive blows we have struck for the defeat of the hopes of our enemies and the assurance of our own have been struck, one after the other, in words and acts as well, by Mr. Roosevelt. The arsenal of democracy, the "four freedoms," lend-lease, the declaration of unlimited emergency, the order to shoot on sight, the production program of 1942—these, one after the other, were victories in the war for men's opinions, and they were victories gained, one after the other, by the President.

The words of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek are more valuable in this total war than armies.

Elmer Davis properly follows the personal line in this psychological warfare. Davis is determined not to allow the Office of War Information to become a propaganda agent in the Axis sense in its relation to the American people or even to people abroad. The Office of War Information explains and interprets the war, gives information on the home front and the battle front. It explains the war aims. Davis demands that he be permitted to tell the truth about



battles fought. He does not seek to minimize losses nor exaggerate victories. He wants the people to know the truth. He rightfully believes that the people can take it. Also, as to the foreign peoples, the people of the Axis and allied and neutral powers, the watchword must be, again, truth. For these, Davis dramatizes our war aims, our prowess, our invincibility, our tremendous ingenuity and resourcefulness in making and streamlining trains and ships and tanks and guns.

The Axis Nations are treated differently than the Allied Nations. Neutral nations are distinguished from both the Allied and the Axis countries. Three different approaches are used, three different channels of information, news, stories, and instruction are marked out and blueprinted. Facts and truth are emphasized as opposed to the Axis, which constantly lies and lies. They promise anything to gain support. Frankly, these Axis lies are now reaching a point where they are boomeranging. Even the German people no longer believe Goebbels' machine and now crane their necks to listen to our broadcasts and read our publications, for they know that in them they find facts.

As this exhibit shows, the Axis seeks to divide and conquer and pit faction against faction, class against class.

The Office of War Information has sought with printed opinion and radio voice to keep Turkey, Switzerland, Sweden, and Portugal if not benevolently neutral at least neutral, and not actively pro-Axis like Spain, not actively hostile like Argentina. If the Office of War Information contributes toward keeping Turkey and Spain from joining up with the Axis, it is worth all the money we can appropriate for its maintenance and more besides.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. There appeared on page 2039 of the RECORD for March 16, in a statement by Senator HOLMAN, a memorandum indicating the type of propaganda that is being put out in this country to discredit Congress. This was reported to him from two different sources. This propaganda was known as Carey Longmire's Washington report.

Mr. CELLER. Who put that out?

Mr. TABER. I understand that was put out by the O. W. I. Does the gentleman approve of their doing that sort of thing? It is that continual overstepping that has destroyed their usefulness. I would hope that instead of criticizing me the gentleman would join me in trying to clean it up. If they are going to be useful, they should stop doing things that are entirely improper.

Mr. CELLER. I think, from my contacts with representatives of the O. W. I. and with Mr. Davis, that they do not want to do those things. I do not know how authentic that so-called statement may be to which the gentleman has just referred, but I am curious to know whether the O. W. I. has sent that out. They have striven with might and main to stick to the truth. I am almost sure

that Mr. Davis does not want to put out things like that.

Mr. TABER. Why do they do it? That is what I cannot understand.

Mr. CELLER. I would be very happy to join with the gentleman to find out what the situation really is.

Mr. TABER. That is what I have been trying to find out. Instead of saying they are going to stop, they criticize someone for making a just criticism of them and trying to make them do the things they ought to do.

Mr. CELLER. Of course, it all depends on the setting from which the criticism comes and the emphasis placed upon certain things. I am sure that if the gentleman and I should sit down with Mr. Davis, or if the gentleman alone should sit down with Elmer Davis and quietly work this thing out by mutual understanding, there would be something done that would be very, very constructive. But sometimes we do not get very far if we attack, if we criticize. We get more if we get together and try mutually to work things out.

I am sure the gentleman will admit there is a purpose for the O. W. I. If the gentleman will examine all this material he will see how necessary it is.

Mr. TABER. There would be a purpose if it were handled right, but when it is handled wrong it does harm.

Mr. CELLER. It is our duty and your duty to point out these things.

Mr. TABER. That is what I have been doing.

Mr. CELLER. I would be the last to criticize the gentleman for getting up on his feet and voicing his views. On the other hand, if I felt the gentleman had overshot the mark, I would not be doing my duty if I did not point that out to him. That is what I am doing in this statement.

Mr. TABER. I did not go as far as Elmer Davis in connection with either of these items.

Mr. CELLER. Beyond peradventure of a doubt, Elmer Davis hates any misrepresentation of the truth, even to the Axis. Davis really has the Axis worried. He knows that for practical purposes untruths, even in Europe, backfire, and the people do not believe even Goebbels any more, because he has lied so frequently. I say, if Davis even desired on the part of O. W. I. to tell an untruth, common sense would dawn on him to the effect that, if he did lie, it would come back to plague them. The Axis is worried about what Davis is doing. Even Goebbels is amazed at O. W. I.'s strength and effectiveness. He has admitted that the Office of War Information is a worthy opponent. Although the Office of War Information for its entire operation will spend this fiscal year ending June 1, 1943, about \$40,000,000, Goebbels will spend more than 10 times that amount, and may, according to some estimates, spend 20 times that, or \$500,000,000.

Davis is more than a match for Goebbels, and has him stymied in Spain, Turkey, Sweden, Portugal, and Switzerland. The pro-Axis Paris radio has cried out frantically that Elmer Davis has 20,000 propagandists working for him. In truth and fact, his entire entourage of

writers, linguists, artists, radio announcers and stars, publicists, and social scientists is but 4,000. Davis has learned to use the radio, press, graphic representation, movies, and every medium of modern information and psychological warfare far more cleverly and effectively than Goebbels.

What shall we do? Shall we cut down appropriations and make more difficult the successful carrying out of war propaganda, or shall we give additional sums, sums that may be somewhat commensurate with the need and the amount being spent by the Nazis, Nippon, and the Fascists. Certainly we should not be niggardly in a matter of this sort. I do hope that the gentleman from New York, when he hears Mr. Davis, will listen carefully, as he usually does, and that he will give in all justice and equity, which always epitomizes what the gentleman does, the necessary funds, and I hope that he will be as generous as possible with appropriations for the O. W. I. If the criticisms of the gentleman from New York are sound, I am sure that Mr. Davis will do all that is required of him to set his house in order.

Mr. TABER. That is what I have been trying to do, to make him set his house in order. I have not made any charge yet that he has not admitted.

Mr. CELLER. Then the gentleman and I are in agreement. We have no quarrel in that regard.

A question has been asked, Does anybody listen to Davis and his protégés over the radio? I cite this to show what they are thinking, and to show that it is all worth the money that we are spending. I shall read now from a current issue of Time:

#### ANYONE LISTENING?

Many United States citizens have wondered who, if anybody, hears Office of War Information's foreign propaganda broadcasts. Office of War Information, which short-waves 2,688 programs (80-percent news) a week toward the rest of the world, decided to find out. The findings could not well be "without probative value."

Proof that the Voice of America carries far into Europe are advertisements in Swiss newspapers announcing United States radio programs and advertising sets with which to receive them.

Best proof that the United States has a sizable Axis radio audience is the irritated voice of the Axis radio itself. Last year Radio Berlin declared: "No other station in the world is as bad as Cincinnati."

Radio Rome once asked: "Who cares about American radio nonsense?" Apparently some Italians do, for the Italian stations are forever burlesquing United States broadcasts. Sample: "An American sub named 'Comfort Station,' manned by five men and a lady assistant, Miss Higgins, has sunk the Italian Navy in the Mediterranean. All Italy's aghast \* \* \*"

Frenchmen continued to write to United States stations long after the republic fell, and during the last 6 months they have written more than ever. They say that transmission is perfect when there is no jamming. Recently Nazi-controlled Radio Paris inquired: "Have you listened to the American radio? No, of course not. It is prohibited. But we have listened for you." A detailed analysis of "the delightfully single-minded American radio" followed.

One week after the Office of War Information beamed two new transmitters on Spain

Spaniards thronged to the United States Embassy in Madrid to express their thanks for the new service.

Polish underground newspapers have appeared complete with Office of War Information news.

Office of War Information's new medium-wave transmitters in Africa (when completed) should sound loudly throughout Europe and the Middle East.

Mr. Speaker, the Overseas Bureau of the O. W. I. works in closest harmony with other agencies.

In cooperation with the Board of Economic Warfare, Lease-Lend, and the Office of Foreign Relief and Rehabilitation, labels and tags are designed and printed by the Bureau to identify all their shipments abroad with a message of good will from the United States of America. Shipments of flour, tea, milk, sugar, cotton goods and threads, clothing, twine, sacks, leather, paper, and chemicals go to north Africa, the Middle East, Turkey, Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, and Portugal. Labels and tag requirements run into millions on each order, but the actual cost to the Bureau is nominal.

Leaflets for the Pacific area are prepared by Japanese experts in the Overseas Bureau of O. W. I. for use in psychological warfare against Japanese troops and civilians. Many of these have been shipped already to bases for distribution by war plane. Others have been stock-piled in anticipation of future demands. Details of the actual distribution and use are military secrets.

These leaflets urge Japanese soldiers to surrender, give publicity to losses concealed by the Japanese Government, set forth the rapid progress of the military and industrial mobilization of the United States, play on Japanese superstition, preach the absurdity of Japan's alliance with Germany and Italy, hold Japanese military leaders responsible for the war, depict the horrors of bombing and other phases of the conflict.

Evidence of the effectiveness of this operation was received recently by cable and press reports from Guadalcanal. The resistance of 800 Japanese soldiers was broken down to the point of surrender by loud speakers and American propaganda leaflets, thus annihilating the Japanese myth of invincibility.

Urgent requests are often filled by air-mailing plates of leaflets prepared here, and printing is done abroad; this speeds up the operation, and circumvents shipping delays. All leaflets for use in Europe are printed in London, where we work closely in cooperation with the British.

All this material is welcomed in the various areas to which it is addressed. A recent message from Beirut said:

Victory is a startlingly attractive piece of propaganda; want hundreds of copies when translated in French and Arabic.

The American consul in Brazzaville, Africa, reported in January that the French edition of the booklet, *Life of Franklin D. Roosevelt*, had been highly successful in that area, appealing to adults as well as children. The consul suggested more booklets featuring biographies of contemporary or historical American figures.

From a school principal in Pretoria, South Africa, came the message:

I have had the pleasure of seeing the excellent publications issued from your office to schools in the Transvaal. I shall be more than grateful if you would place my school on your mailing list. Is it possible for you to send me the previous issues of your publications? They are of great educational value.

A letter from the Transvaal says:

Your letter, stamps, and brochures to hand. Thanks very much for the various items, and I must congratulate you on the excellence of the brochures. They certainly knock spots out of other war propaganda I have seen and my boys devour them with zest.

From Madeira comes the message:

The illustrated booklets have dignity and carry much prestige because of their superior workmanship and excellent illustrations. They will be distributed to local officials, lawyers, doctors, bankers, and prominent businessmen, to various clubs and syndicates, to professors and teachers and parish priests and so forth. Hundreds of persons have requested this type of literature. A minimum of 350 pamphlets each month is needed.

Cairo reports:

Created several riots in Cairo by distributing Office of War Information pamphlets. In one of the coffee houses, circulated among the Cairo cafe society blotters, window stickers, the *Life of Roosevelt*, the *Four Freedoms*, and other pamphlets. When they had exhausted their display, there were demands for more. Word had spread throughout the cafe that the Americans were there with pamphlets. When they returned to their car, two scores of clamoring Egyptians gathered around them, all crying for pamphlets. Even the cops were crying for stickers. A crowd was around the car and kept on handing out pamphlets and stickers until there wasn't one left.

Other messages testifying to their usefulness have come from such scattered points as Monrovia, Funchal, Dublin, Australia, New Delhi, Lagos, Iceland, Madrid, Lisbon, Sweden, and England.

These publications reach millions of men and women who urgently need their message of truth and hope. By train and ship and airplane they reach their far-flung destinations. Pamphlets and small booklets travel through the underground. Leaflets are dropped from the air. Their message is one of courage to the people of neutral countries. Wherever they go, they remind the suffering and oppressed that their courage need not fail while they have this close link with America.

We must remember that Germany is a dictatorship—every radio station, newspaper, and magazine is at the disposal of Dr. Goebbels, the German propaganda chief. There are 2,500 daily newspapers which are directly under Goebbels' control. Every motion picture made in Germany reflects the Nazi point of view. Every book published in Germany reflects the Nazi point of view. Some 18,000 periodicals and magazines belong to Dr. Goebbels completely.

In the occupied countries every newspaper and magazine and publishing house has been taken over by the conquerors. In Belgium, in France, in Norway, they have found local quislings

willing to do a hired man's job. These hired men spread the Nazi poison in their own language.

Sometimes I think that we Members of Congress sit at our desks in calm contentment and ignore the stormy and turbulent currents of a world at war. We are too much concerned with politics, with mending our fences at home; we are too much concerned with being Democrats or Republicans and not enough concerned with being Americans. Good God, gentlemen, either we survive as a nation or we do not survive. Either we appropriate every cent necessary to fight the war—whether it is for guns or planes or for propaganda—or we tuck in our toes and decide that the Germans, the Japanese, the Italians, are smarter people than we are.

I do not know how you feel about this. I do know how I feel. I want to fight the Axis on every front. I want to fight with guns and bullets. I want to fight with planes and ships and submarines. I want to fight with money and radio stations and propaganda. I want to fight all along the line because I know that is the way we will win.

Let me give you some idea of how extensive the Axis propaganda job is. Over there [gesture] on a table you will find some of the publications of our Axis enemies. This collection is not complete. If you will look in the master catalog you will find hundreds of titles which used to be available in this country. I don't think I have to emphasize the point; the German Government has become the greatest publishing enterprise in history. It is a mail order house for lies.

The Germans are not stingy. They spend money on their lies. An excellent example is the book *Germany*, which you will find over there on the table. It is very ambitious. There are 120 photographs of German art and industry, of youth training, of armed might. That book has the most expensive type of binding; most of the work has been done carefully by hand. What do you think that book cost the Germans? I can tell you: In American money it cost about \$4 a copy. Think of it, \$4 for each copy. And they send out carloads—shiploads.

The Germans have published thousands of books. You will find some of them on this table.

I repeat, I want to show you how excellent this book *Germany* is. It is called, significantly, *Germany*. It is most beautifully gotten up—the finest pictures you could ever see. It symbolizes Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, and all the personalities of the Nazi regime. Examine it and you will see the glorious photography involved in this book, and you will see the swastika as it symbolizes the Nazi regime. I would indeed hope that all the Members of the House could see this book called *Germany*. Many did see it on Monday. It costs \$4 a copy to publish in English alone, and that does not include the transportation. It was published in many languages at even greater cost per unit. It was estimated that the Germans spent \$1,200,000 on its publication alone; that is, for 300,000 English copies, which it was estimated were sent



out by the German propaganda machine. Surely Germany is not stingy, if you take that as an example.

Here is another which has about the same format as our publication called *Look*. We cannot disregard this magazine called *Freedom*, which is put out, for example, by Japan. It is their military propaganda magazine, which shows Japan's military might over Britain and the United States of America. It goes forth in English and many other languages. I advise that we look at it. It costs millions of dollars on the part of Japan to send books out of this character. Japan, as a matter of fact, sends out 23 magazines in all languages—all attesting to the glory of Nippon. Some are especially designed for children in occupied territories to have them grow up steeped in Nipponism and to become loyal Jap subjects.

Here is one called *Tempo*, sent out by the Italians. It is very much like *Victory*, and very much like *Freedom*, sent out by Japan. It is published in at least eight editions—Italian, Lithuanian, Croat, French, Greek, Rumanian, Spanish, and Hungarian. It goes out weekly and depicts the so-called might of the Axis. Mussolini is its great hero.

Here is one called *Signal*. It is published by the Reich in German, French, Italian, Swedish, Norwegian, Spanish, Finnish, Portuguese, English, Greek, Arabic, and Dutch, and two additional Balkan languages, and Hungarian. It is one of the most widely circulated of the Axis picture magazines. Copies of *Signal*, *Tempo*, *Freedom*, and others are on all newsstands in Ankara, Stockholm, Berne, Madeira, Madrid, and Lisbon. Why should not our publications be found on these same newsstands and kiosks? O. W. I. performs just that function. To come back to this magazine, *Signal*; it is the special foreign propaganda edition of the German weekly illustrated newspaper, *Berliner Illustrierte Zeitung*. It is not distributed in Germany but is all over the world. This is the closest example of propaganda that I know to the magazine, *Victory*. Like *Victory*, it is not circulated in Germany. *Victory* cost \$800,000 this past year. This one magazine alone sent out from Berlin, it is estimated, costs \$2,500,000.

Here is one called *Manchukuo*, published by Japan in English, German, French, Chinese, and Dutch. It says, for example:

Peoples of all classes in Manchukuo are doing their utmost to help build up an ideal Japanese Government. Under this new type of Japanese Government the standard of living has been raised. Industry has made rapid progress.

Thus Japan is lauded and is presented as the savior of Manchukuo and the East.

Certainly we cannot remain supine and indifferent to that type of propaganda. We must counter with all we have within us. That is what I want the Office of War Information to do with appropriate appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, unless there is another special order to follow, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended 5 minutes, that he may answer a few questions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] has 10 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the gentleman from Michigan does not care to use the time, I would like to ask that the gentleman's time be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does not the gentleman feel that it is very regrettable that not only the effective and worthy publications by the Office of War Information, which have been mentioned, but, in many other respects, moves and acts of the President and high civil authorities are attributed to politics when in actual truth they are nothing more than a part of our war effort? Has not the gentleman heard it insinuated by some who talk about adjourning politics that the President's trip to Casablanca was a build-up for a political future?

Mr. CELLER. I have heard that, and I certainly, with the gentleman, deplore such aspersions against the President.

Mr. MURDOCK. My God! What would they have our Commander in Chief do? Hibernate for the duration? Every move he makes to carry on this war vigorously and successfully may be attributed by a certain type of mind to political motives with an eye on 1944. I want to say in regard to the matter of the Commander in Chief's perilous trip to plan the war in Africa that as the father of a son in Africa, who went over with the big convoy, landing mid screaming shells over his head, and with hostile French planes strafing the beaches on the African coast, I rejoice that the Commander in Chief made that same hazardous journey as a part of our war effort. My soldier son was but one of many thousand American boys heartened by this move to shape up plans to drive the Axis out of Africa as a beginning of victory. Yes, and there was a lot of criticism of somebody for what was behind the Darlan cease fire order. But how many thousands of our boys are alive this hour because of that order?

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, as long as I have a few moments left, I would like to go over some of these other exhibits, which indicate the resourcefulness and ingenuity of the Axis propaganda machine which grinds out tons and tons of this type of literature.

Here is *The Story of King George and His Prime Minister*, in Arabic, with pictures. It is a sort of a cartoon affair. It is published by the German Government. It is worthy of your perusal. Millions were sent out in Arabic to Asia. This booklet is anti-British and anti-American.

It depicts British imperialism and the ineffectiveness of American intervention

in the war, showing at the end that the only salvation of the Arab Nation depends on a final victory won by almighty Germany and her allies.

It is full of the personality angle. England has countered by building up in its own pamphlets Churchill and King George.

But we have been, shall I say, woefully stingy and pinch-penny as far as the Office of War Information is concerned to checkmate and counter those pamphlets that are going into Arabia.

I am not criticizing anyone. I am speaking generally. We will spend only \$40,000,000 for the over-all work of the Office of War Information, both domestic and foreign, for the fiscal year ending July 1, 1943. We have a number of outposts in various parts of the world, 28 of them in Allied and neutral lands, exclusive of South America. The most important of these listening and distribution posts are in places like Stockholm, Cairo, Chungking, London, Beirut, and Leopoldville. We must strengthen those outposts to keep the neutral countries informed and to win more from the Axis in the Axis-controlled countries. From these outposts the Voice of America speaks by broadcasts directly and through recordings in 24 languages.

Mr. TABER. The trouble is that they have only 250 out of the 4,000 outside who are doing that sort of thing. The rest of them are engaged in other things that they ought not to be doing. This thing will all develop. It is not producing results. I think the gentleman should go over to New York and go to Fifty-seventh Street.

Mr. CELLER. I have not been over there. I, however, certainly do not agree with everything the gentleman has said, but in as kindly light as possible I try to point out what I do not agree with. But I do hope the debate this afternoon, this symposium as I call it, will have good results, that it will bring information and illumination to places which might be a little dark now.

There is a tendency here to underestimate the Italians. As a matter of fact they turn out excellent publications. Some of the Italian magazines which have flooded South America and neutral countries are *Tempo*, *Italia*, and *La Rivista*. Besides there are at least six which are liberally distributed.

The Japanese also have done a brilliant job. Do not underestimate the Japs. They turn out many regular publications which are spread across the Orient. They use the best of paper and their photographs are excellent. The leading four publications of the Japanese are: *Pictorial Orient*, *Nippon*, *Nippon Today* and *Tomorrow*, and—this may give you a laugh—*Freedom*. *Freedom* is a publication put out by people who do not believe in freedom.

Obviously, the Japanese publications are aimed principally at the Orient.

The Axis has plenty of translators. If you look at that collection you will find more than 100 pamphlets, published in German, French, English, Dutch, Spanish, Italian, Polish, Portuguese, and Arabic. I am not a linguist and I confess that I have not read them all. But I do

know that they are intended to divide and conquer. For instance, there is one pamphlet called, in English translation, *All for the Farmer*. This was distributed in Belgium and France. It was printed in French, Dutch, and Flemish. Why? I will tell you why. Because the Germans hoped to split apart the different racial groups in Belgium.

Most Axis magazines carry advertising. This makes them look as if they were on the square. I have heard criticism on the floor of this House about the amount of money that is being spent by the Office of War Information to tell America's story abroad. I quarrel, too, with the amount of money that is being spent. I think it is too little.

I come from a town—Brooklyn—where people are used to big league baseball. America is now at war and it is big league war. You cannot buy star players with counterfeit money, and you cannot win a war by saving money. You have to spend money. I know that every Member of this House wants to feed the soldiers the best food that can be bought or found. I know that every Member of this House wants to give the soldiers the best equipment that can be manufactured. That costs money, and not one of you begrudges it. But there is more to war—modern war—than the cost of shot and shell.

In the few moments remaining I shall discuss a few more of these Axis publications.

Here is one called *German Christmas Carols*, a charming little booklet of 30 pages describing the German Christmas. It was mailed by the thousands by the German Library of Information as a Christmas present to Americans before the start of the war. I understand that this mailing of greetings and pamphlets at Christmas was a regular custom of the German Library of Information. That this was done at a time when Nazi bodies were already plotting the war against the United States—done to create an impression of good feeling—seems to me like wrapping a bomb in Christmas holly.

Here is another, written in Spanish and called *The Trickster Tricked*. It is a vicious comic strip in colors, outlining how John Bull tricked the fools of Europe to fight his battle. When defeated at Dunkerque, John Bull turns to another fool (Uncle Sam) for aid. Uncle Sam promises to help, but instead he steals everything John Bull possesses. I wish every Member of this House could study this pamphlet.

And here is a news bulletin, issued in Arabic by the German Consulate General in Tangier. It builds up German might and dwells in detail on Allied shipping losses. There is a detailed list with names of ships and tonnage lost by the British and dates of sinking since the beginning of the war. This list covers five pages.

Finally, here is *Berlin-Rome-Tokyo*, published by the German Foreign Office to encourage cultural relationships among the people of the Axis. This monthly magazine is estimated to cost 75 cents per copy to produce, and is distributed to important Axis officials and

their friends abroad. Printed on the finest paper, it contains superb reproductions of paintings and a handsome Japanese print on special rice paper.

These are some of the publications of the enemy. I ask you, gentlemen, are we to leave them unanswered?

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CARL VINSON, for 10 days, on account of official business.

To Mr. HINSHAW (at the request of Mr. HOLMES of Washington), for Wednesday, March 17, and Thursday, March 18, 1943, on account of illness.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 133. An act to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1975. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2023. An act to amend section 301, *World War Veterans' Act*, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year level premium term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside the continental limits of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 2030. An act to permit the shipment tax-free of certain tobacco products to territories of the United States for the use of members of the military and naval forces of the United States.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 303. An act to extend the jurisdiction of naval courts martial in time of war or national emergency to certain persons outside the continental limits of the United States.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 133. An act to amend and clarify certain provisions of law relating to functions of the War Shipping Administration, and for other purposes.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 51 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, March 18, 1943.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 149.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The committee will hold a public hearing on Thursday, March 18, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1361 (Mr. LANE) and H. R. 1409 (Mr. FOGARTY), conferring upon men in the merchant marine the same rights, privileges, and benefits accruing to those serving in the armed forces, and on H. R. 1858, to confer the same rights, privileges, and benefits upon members of the United States merchant marine who served during the World War as are conferred upon members of the armed forces of the United States who served during such war.

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, April 1, 1943, at 10 a. m., on S. 163 (H. R. 498) to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship-construction reserve funds, and for other purposes.

Congressman GEORGE J. BATES, of Massachusetts, patron of the bill H. R. 1766, upon which hearings were scheduled on Thursday, April 8, 1943, is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs and of a subcommittee of that committee, duties of which will compel him to be absent from Washington on Thursday, April 8, 1943. Accordingly, the hearing scheduled for that date has been changed to Thursday, April 15, 1943, at 10 a. m.

##### COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 694, a bill to provide for the attachment, garnishment, execution, or trustee process of wages and salaries of civil officers and employees of the United States, at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, March 24, 1943, in room 346, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

259. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting the second semiannual report of the operations of the Office of Administrator of Rent Control, covering the period July 1 to December 31, 1942, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 172. Resolution for consideration of H. R. 1698, a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to aid in stabilizing the cost of living" (Public Law No. 729, 77th Cong.); without amendment (Rept. No. 253). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FERNANDEZ: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 323. A bill to authorize the exploration of proposed dam site located on Indian lands within the State of New Mexico; without amendment (Rept.



No. 254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 2218. A bill to provide a method for the payment currently of individual income taxes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAPOZZOLI:

H. R. 2219. A bill to exempt certain merchant seamen from the Victory tax and from collection of tax at source on wages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 2220. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by providing a method whereby the services of those interfering with war production may be made available on the home front; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 2221. A bill to abolish and correct unfair practices and substandard working conditions and to raise living standards among the employees of the United States Veterans' Administration; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. SASSCER:

H. R. 2222. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing a reduction in the course of instruction at the Naval Academy," approved June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 238); to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2223. A bill to relieve newspapers and periodical publications which have voluntarily suspended publication for the duration of the war from payment of second-class application fees upon resumption of publication; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 2224. A bill to extend certain benefits of the Canal Zone Retirement Act of March 2, 1931, as amended, to certain employees covered by the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. PLOESER:

H. R. 2225. A bill to amend the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, to aid in preventing inflation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DOMENGAUX:

H. R. 2226. A bill to prohibit the Federal Government from aiding in the production of rice outside the United States, its Territories, or possessions; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 2230. A bill to provide for the acquisition and toll-free operation by the United States of the interstate bridge between Rainier, Ore., and Longview, Wash.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON:

H. Res. 173. Resolution to promote research on mineral resources by Federal aid to the States; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana:

H. R. 2227. A bill for the relief of Louie F. Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 2228. A bill for the relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CROSSER:

H. R. 2229. A bill for the relief of William Meyer; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

281. By Mr. MOTT: House Joint Memorial No. 8 of the House of Representatives of the State of Oregon (the Senate jointly concurring therein), memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact such legislation as will require of the Bonneville administration a payment in lieu of taxes to the States of Oregon and Washington on a basis substantially equivalent to that which has been found proper in the operations of the Tennessee Valley Authority and Boulder Dam; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

282. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of the Vermont Hotel Association, opposing Representative Bryson's bill and stating prohibition is no cure for absenteeism; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

283. By Mr. RABAUT: Resolution of Branch 23 of the Detroit Association of the National Association of Postal Supervisors, endorsing legislation to provide increased compensation to all postal employees of \$400 per annum, in addition to their present basic salary and time and one-half for work performed in excess of 40 hours based on 260-day average; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

284. By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing Congress respecting the policy of the State of Utah relating to its waters and the use thereof by the adjoining States and the United States; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

285. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to pass at the present session of Congress a social-security law which will allow benefits to every citizen who desires the same, including members of the military forces of our country; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

286. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to investigate all activities and practices of the rent section of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Rules.

287. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Building and Construction Trades Council of San Francisco, relative to the rationing and price-control program of the Office of Price Administration; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

288. Also, Senate Resolution No. 65 of the State of California relating to the growing of guayule for rubber production; to the Committee on Agriculture.

289. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Elsie J. Beaty, post adjutant, Taylor County Post, No. 12, the American Legion, Grafton, W. Va., urging the acquiring and providing of sufficient land for the extension and improvement of the national cemetery in the State of West Virginia, at Grafton; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

290. By Mr. SULLIVAN: Memorial of the Nevada Legislature, relating to access roads for the transportation of strategic war materials; to the Committee on Appropriations.

291. Also, memorial of the Nevada Legislature, concerning the price of strategic war metals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

292. By Mr. WHITE: Memorial of the Idaho State Legislature, stating that it is the policy of the State to maintain jurisdiction over, and control of, the use of waters

in Idaho for all beneficial purposes, etc., and authorizing the Governor to direct the State reclamation engineer to take action to carry out these policies; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

293. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of the board of education of school district No. 2, Warren Township, Macomb County, Mich., urging Federal aid equivalent to amount of tax that would be paid to the respective units of government in whose jurisdiction defense plants are located as if the said plants and machinery were the property of a private enterprise and subject to taxation; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 18, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Holy, holy, holy, in the name of our blessed Saviour, we look up to Thee in faith as an inspiration of all good. In the duties of the day, in the extended fields of influence and power, help us to remember our dependence on Thee. Thy laws are imperative, perfect in their character, and perpetual in their obligation; inspire us to write them in our hearts. Descend upon us, O spirit of truth and wisdom, that our judgments and decisions may conform to Thy holy will.

In this trouble-bent world, we are deeply sobered by the unspeakable crimes on homeless millions and plundered lands. Heavenly Father, Thy will bids us be strong and the strong be just; therefore let us labor without ceasing for the new age, the new progress, and the new joy. O crown us with that faith which makes men steadfast and unafraid and yet with a humble trust. Keep us far, far away from the impatience of unbelief, knowing that in the magnitude of character it is wise and good to remember that benediction which is pronounced upon them who quietly seek—"They that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength" in the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday were read and approved.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 729. An act providing for the deferment from military service of persons engaged in agricultural occupations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 2068. An act making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to